ARY
FORT WAYNE & ALLEN CO., IND.

[redacted]

[redacted]

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 05346 391 2

GC
973.006
M69,
1919-1920

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE & ALLEN CO., IND.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012

http://archive.org/details/mississippivallev6miss

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

Board of Editors

DAN E. CLARK
ISAAC J. COX
MILO M. QUAIFE
WALTER L. FLEMING
JAMES A. JAMES
ARTHUR G. DOUGHTY
ARCHIBALD HENDERSON
JAMES F. WILLARD

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

VOLUME VI
June, 1919, to March, 1920

Published quarterly by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association

93417

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI

NUMBER 1. JUNE, 1919

ARTICLES

THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS AND THE BLUFFTON MOVEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA. Chauncey S. Boucher 3
THE SOUTH AND THE ARMING OF THE SLAVES. Thomas Robson Hay 34
HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE OLD NORTHWEST. Arthur C. Cole . 74

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A FRAGMENTARY JOURNAL OF WILLIAM L. SUBLETTE . . . 99
BOOK REVIEWS 111
NEWS AND COMMENTS 154

NUMBER 2. SEPTEMBER, 1919

ARTICLES

WESTERN TRAVEL, 1800-1820. Harlow Lindley 167
THE FRENCH COUNCIL OF COMMERCE IN RELATION TO AMERICAN TRADE. Ella Lonn 192
THE UNITED STATES FACTORY SYSTEM FOR TRADING WITH THE INDIANS, 1796-1822. Royal B. Way 220
HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN CANADA, 1918-1919. Lawrence J. Burpee 236

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A FRONTIER OFFICER'S MILITARY ORDER BOOK 260
BOOK REVIEWS 268
NEWS AND COMMENTS 295

NUMBER 3. DECEMBER, 1919

ARTICLES

NEW LIGHT ON DON DIEGO DE PEÑALOSA. Charles W. Hackett . 313
THE LAST MEETING OF THE CONFEDERATE CABINET. James E. Walmsley 336
THE KHAKI JOURNALISTS, 1917-1919. Arthur M. Schlesinger . . 350
HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE TRANS-MISSISSIPPI NORTHWEST, 1917-1919. John C. Parish 360

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

FINANCIAL REPORTS RELATING TO LOUISIANA, 1766-1788 . . . 381
BOOK REVIEWS 398
NEWS AND COMMENTS 440

NUMBER 4. MARCH, 1920

ARTICLES

ISAAC SHELBY AND THE GENET MISSION. Archibald Henderson . 451
STEAMBOATING ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AFTER THE CIVIL WAR: A MISSISSIPPI MAGNATE. Lester B. Shippee 470
DIPLOMACY OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO REGARDING THE ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC, 1848-1860. J. Fred Rippy . 503
DANIEL WOLSEY VOORHEES. Henry D. Jordan 532

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

BLEEDING KANSAS AND THE POTTAWATOMIE MURDERS . . . 556
AN UNKNOWN EXPEDITION TO SANTA FE IN 1807 560
BOOK REVIEWS 563
NEWS AND COMMENTS 601

INDEX

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

The names of contributors are printed in small capitals. (R) *indicates that the contribution is a review.*

"A college man in khaki," by Wainwright Merrill, reviewed, 152.

A frontier officer's military order book, (doc.) by Louis Pelzer, 260-267.

"A lieutenant of cavalry in Lee's army," by G. W. Beale, reviewed, 282.

A Mississippi magnate: Steamboating on the upper Mississippi after the civil war, by L. B. Shippee, 470-502.

"A new municipal program," by C. R. Woodruff, reviewed, 575-576.

"A republic of nations," by R. C. Minor, reviewed, 399-401.

"A society of states," by W. T. S. Stallybrass, reviewed, 399-401.

"A study of state aid to public schools in Minnesota," by R. A. Kent, reviewed, 425-426.

"A world court in the light of the United States supreme court," by T. W. Balch, reviewed, 398-399.

Abbott, Samuel, "The dramatic story of Old Glory," reviewed, 600.

Abbott, Wilbur C., "Colonel John Scott of Long Island, 1634(?)-1696," reviewed, 285.

Abel, Annie H., "The American Indian as participant in the civil war," reviewed, 578-579.

"Above the battle," by Romain Rolland, reviewed, 294.

"Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters," by L. E. Robinson, reviewed, 586.

Ackerman, Carl, "Mexico's dilemma," reviewed, 112.

Adams, George P., "Idealism and the modern age," reviewed, 274-275.

"Alaskan wilderness, In the," by G. B. Gordon, reviewed, 142-144.

ALVORD, C. W., (R) Wallace's "The Maseres letters, 1766-1768," 596-597.

AMBLER, CHARLES H., (R) Abel's "The American Indian as participant in the civil war," 578-579; "The John P. Branch historical papers of Randolph-Macon college," reviewed, 123.

"America and Britain," by A. C. McLaughlin, reviewed, 268-269.

"America at war," by A. B. Hart, reviewed, 404.

"America in France," by Frederick Palmer, reviewed, 149-150.

"America, The new," by Frank Dilnot, reviewed, 269.

"American colonies, The quit-rent system in the," by B. W. Bond, reviewed, 410-411.

"American family, Social history of the," by A. W. Calhoun, reviewed, 408-409.

"American labor and the war," by Samuel Gompers, reviewed, 291-292.

"American problems of reconstruction," by E. M. Friedman, reviewed, 116-117.

American trade, The French council of commerce in relation to, by Ella Lonn, 192-219.

An unknown expedition to Santa Fe in 1807, (doc.) by J. J. Hill, 560-562.

Andrews, Charles M., "The fathers of New England," reviewed, 284-285.

Arming of the slaves, The south and the, by T. R. Hay, 34-73.

Atkinson, Caroline P., "Letters of Susan Hale," reviewed, 585.

"Authority in the modern state," by H. J. Laski, reviewed, 569.

Balch, Thomas W., "A world court in the light of the United States supreme court," reviewed, 398-399.

Beale, G. W., "A lieutenant of cavalry in Lee's army," reviewed, 282.

Beveridge, Albert J., "Life of John Marshall," reviewed, 581-584.

Bishop, Avard L., "Industry and trade," reviewed, 407-408.

Bleeding Kansas and the Pottawatomie murders, (doc.) by M. M. Quaife, 556-560.

BLEGEN, THEODORE C., (R) Hart's "School history of the United States," 146; (R) Palmer's "America in France," 149-150.

Bluffton movement in South Carolina, The annexation of Texas and the, by C. S. Boucher, 3-33.

Bolton, Herbert E., "Kino's historical memoir of Pimeria Alta," reviewed, 428-429.

Bond, Beverly W., Jr., (R) Esarey's "History of Indiana from 1850 to the present," 131-133; "The quit-rent system in the American colonies," reviewed, 410-411.

Bonham, Milledge L., Jr., (R) Collins' "The truth about lynching and the negro in the south," 124-125.

Boucher, Chauncey S., *The annexation of Texas and the Bluffton movement in South Carolina*, 3-33.

Boyd, William K., (R) Bond's "The quit-rent system in the American colonies," 410-411; (R) Orth's "The boss and the machine," 417-418.

Breckenridge, S. P., (R) Gallaher's "Legal and political status of women in Iowa," 423-425.

Brooke, Tucker, and Henry S. Canby, "War aims and peace ideals," reviewed, 572-573.

Brosnan, C. J., "History of the state of Idaho," reviewed, 427.

Brown, Arthur J., "The mastery of the far east," reviewed, 437-439.

Burnham, Smith, "Our beginnings in Europe and America," reviewed, 598.

Burpee, Lawrence J., *Historical activities in Canada, 1918-1919*, 236-259.

Cady, and Sauer and Cowles, "Starved Rock state park and its environs," reviewed, 137.

Calhoun, Arthur W., "Social history of the American family," reviewed, 408-409.

Canada, Historical activities in, 1918-1919, by L. J. Burpee, 236-259.

Canby, Henry S., and Tucker Brooke, "War aims and peace ideals," reviewed, 572-573.

"Carranza, Mexico under," by T. E. Gibbon, reviewed, 436-437.

"Carroll, Charles, of Carrollton, Life of," by L. A. Leonard, reviewed, 286.

Carter, William H., "Life of Lieutenant General Chaffee," reviewed, 281-282.

"Chaffee, Life of Lieutenant General," by W. H. Carter, reviewed, 281-282.

"Chandler, Zachariah, Public life of, 1851-1875," by W. C. Harris, reviewed, 129-131.

Chapman, Charles E., (R) Fletcher's "The problem of the Pacific," 563; "History of Spain," reviewed, 269-271.

Chase, Frederic Hathaway, "Lemuel Shaw," reviewed, 584-585.

Chesterton, Cecil, "History of the United States," reviewed, 407.

"China, History of early relations between the United States and, 1784-1844," by K. S. Latourette, reviewed, 111-112.

"Civil war, History of the," by J. F. Rhodes, reviewed, 280-281.

Clark, Elmer T., "Social studies of the war," reviewed, 574-575.

Clement, Ernest W., "Short history of Japan," reviewed, 437-439.

Cole, Arthur C., (R) Dodd's "The cotton kingdom," 421-422; *Historical activities in the old northwest*, 74-98; (R) Macy's "The anti-slavery crusade," 416-417; "The era of the civil war, 1848-1870," reviewed, 135-137.

Cole, Fay-Cooper, (R) Kalaw's "Self-government in the Philippines," 565-567.

Collins, Winfield H., "The truth about lynching and the negro in the south," reviewed, 124-125.

"Colonel John Scott of Long Island, 1634(?)-1696," by W. C. Abbott, reviewed, 285.

"Colorado, The Union colony at Greeley," by J. F. Willard, reviewed, 426-427.

Confederate cabinet, The last meeting of the, by J. E. Walmsley, 336-349.

"Connecticut in transition, 1775-1818," by R. J. Purcell, reviewed, 118-19.

Cooper, Clayton S., "Understanding South America," reviewed, 435-436.

Corning, A. Elwood, "Hamilton Fish," reviewed, 282.

Corwin, Edward S., (R) Beveridge's "Life of John Marshall," 581-584; (R) Chase's "Lemuel Shaw," 584-585; "The president's control of foreign relations," reviewed, 407.

Cowles, Sauer, Cady, and, "Starved Rock state park and its environs," reviewed, 137.

Cox, Isaac J., (R.) Ackerman's "Mexico's dilemma," 112; (R) Bolton's "Kino's historical memoir of Pimeria Alta," 428-429; (R) Chapman's "History of Spain," 269-271; (R) Farrand's "Development of the United States from colonies to a world power," 404-406; (R) Robertson's "Rise of the Spanish-American republics," 272-274; (R) Schoenrich's "Santo Domingo," 113; (R) Sweet's "History of Latin America," 432-435.

Crosby, Oscar T., "International war, its causes and its cure," reviewed, 290-291.

Crowther, Elizabeth, (R) Porter's "History of suffrage in the United States," 114-115.

Cunningham, Charles H., (doc.) *Financial reports relating to Louisiana*, 381-397.

Dale, Harrison C., (doc.) *Fragmentary*

journal of William L. Sublette, 99-110.
Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, by H. D. Jordan, 552-555; early life, 532; attitude toward slavery, 533-537; congressional career during civil war, 537-540; attitude on reconstruction, 541-542; later congressional career, 543; attitude on tariff, 544; favors free silver, 545-547; opposition to national banks, 548; shifting of attitude on the tariff, 548-550; attitude on the Indian question, 551; on expansion, 551; other public issues, 552; question of relation to Knights of the Golden Circle, 552-553; reputation as lawyer, 553-555.
Davidson, Gordon C., "The North West company," reviewed, 411-414.
Davis, William S., (R) Gill's "Naval power in the war," 151.
"Democracy and world relations," by D. S. Jordan, reviewed, 399-401.
Densmore, Frances, "Teton Sioux music," reviewed, 141-142.
"Detroit, Historical geography of," by A. E. Parkins, reviewed, 423.
"Development of the United States from colonies to a world power," by Max Farrand, reviewed, 404-406.
Dilnot, Frank, "The new America," reviewed, 269.
Diplomacy of the United States and Mexico regarding the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, by J. F. Rippy, 503-531; United States interest in the Tehuantepec route, 503-505; the Garay grant, 505-507; the Letcher-Padraza convention, 508-512; refusal of Mexico to ratify the treaty, 513-515; activities of the New Orleans company, 515-517; attitude of Mexican press, 517-518; efforts to quiet Mexican suspicions, 519-520; the Mexican point of view, 521; the United States point of view, 522; action in congress on question, 523; the Sloo grant, 524-525; indifference of democratic administration, 526; the Gadsden treaty, 526-527; combination of Sloo and Hargous interests, 528; failure of whole project, 529-531.
Dodd, William E., "The cotton kingdom," reviewed, 421-422.
Dodge, Daniel K., (R) Robinson's "Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters," 586.
Dole, Esther M., (R) Andrews' "The fathers of New England," 284-285; (R) Atkinson's "Letters of Susan Hale," 585; (R) Johnson's "Highways and byways of Florida," 124; (R) Moore's "What the war teaches about education," 292-293; (R) West's "The war and education," 292-293.
"Dutch and English on the Hudson," by M. W. Goodwin, reviewed, 420.
Eckenrode, H. J., (R) Ambler's "The John P. Branch historical papers of Randolph-Macon college," 123; (R) Burnham's "Our beginnings in Europe and America," 598; (R) Flippin's "The royal government in Virginia, 1624-1775," 122; (R) Wertenbaker's "Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688," 589.
"Educational legislation and administration in the state of New York from 1777 to 1850," by E. G. Hobson, reviewed, 586-587.
Edwards, Martha L., (R) Faris' "Historic shrines of America," 275-276.
"Elementary American history and government," by J. A. Woodburn, reviewed, 288.
Ellingwood, A. R., (R) Laski's "Authority in the modern state," reviewed, 569; (R) Munro's "The government of the United States," 278-280; (R) Willoughby's "Introduction to the study of the government of modern states," 568.
Ely, Richard T., "The world war and leadership in a democracy," reviewed, 399-401.
Esarey, Logan, "History of Indiana from 1850 to the present," reviewed, 131-133; (R) Pease's "The frontier state, 1818-1848," 133-135.
"Evolution of the constitution of the United States of America and history of the Monroe doctrine," by J. A. Kasson, reviewed, 576-577.
"Experts in city government," by E. A. Fitzpatrick, reviewed, 409.
"Far east, The mastery of the," by A. J. Brown, reviewed, 437-439.
Faris, John T., "Historic shrines of America," reviewed, 275-276.
Farrand, Max, "Development of the United States from colonies to a world power," reviewed, 404-406.
"Federal power: its growth and necessity," by H. L. West, reviewed, 113-114.
"Fighting the spoilsmen," by W. D. Foulke, reviewed, 580-581.
Financial reports relating to Louisiana (doc.), by C. H. Cunningham, 381-397.
Fish, Carl R., (R) Corwin's "The president's control of foreign relations," 407.
"Fish, Hamilton," by A. E. Corning, reviewed, 282.
Fitzpatrick, Edward A., "Experts in city government," reviewed, 409.
Fletcher, C. Brunsdon, "The problem of the Pacific," reviewed, 563.

Flippin, Percy S., "The royal government in Virginia, 1624-1775," reviewed, 122.
"Florida, Highways and byways of," Clifton Johnson, reviewed, 124.
Foulke, William D., "Fighting the spoilsmen," reviewed, 580-581.
Fragmentary journal of William L. Sublette (doc.), by H. C. Dale, 99-110.
Friedman, Elisha M., "American problems of reconstruction," reviewed, 116-117.
"From Vauquois hill to Exermont," by Claire Kenamore, reviewed, 593-594.
Frost, Wesley, "German submarine warfare," reviewed, 148-149.
FULLER, GEORGE N., (R) Harris' "Public life of Zachariah Chandler, 1851-1875," 129-131; (R) Osborn's "The iron hunter," 589-592; (R) Parkins' "Historical geography of Detroit," 423.
Gallaher, Ruth A., "Legal and political status of women in Iowa," reviewed, 423-425.
Gann, Thomas W. F., "The Maya Indians of southern Yucatan and northern British Honduras," reviewed, 431.
GARDNER, C. O., (R) Gilbertson's "The county," 117.
Garvin, J. L., "The economic foundations of peace," reviewed, 288-290.
Genet mission, Isaac Shelby and the, by Archibald Henderson, 451-469.
"George Westinghouse," by F. E. Leupp, reviewed, 283-284.
"German submarine warfare," by Wesley Frost, reviewed, 148-149.
Gibbon, Thomas E., "Mexico under Carranza," reviewed, 436-437.
Giddings, Franklin H., "The responsible state," reviewed, 399-401.
Gilbertson, H. S., "The county," reviewed, 117.
Gill, C. C., "Naval power in the war," reviewed, 151.
Gompers, Samuel, "American labor and the war," reviewed, 291-292.
Goodwin, Maud W., "Dutch and English on the Hudson," reviewed, 420.
Gordon, George B., "In the Alaskan wilderness," reviewed, 142-144.
"Government and the war," by Spenser Wilkinson, reviewed, 570-572.
"Government organization in war time and after," by W. F. Willoughby, reviewed, 570.
HACKETT, CHARLES W., *New light on Don Diego de Peñalosa: proof that he never made an expedition from Santa Fe to Quivira and the Mississippi river in 1662*, 313-335.
Halévy, Daniel, "President Wilson," reviewed, 419.
HALL, ARNOLD B., (R) Kasson's "Evolution of the constitution of the United States of America and history of the Monroe doctrine," 576-577.
"Hamilton Fish," by A. E. Corning, reviewed, 282.
HAMILTON, J. G. DE ROULHAC, (R) Halévy's "President Wilson," 419.
Harris, Wilmer C., "Public life of Zachariah Chandler, 1851-1875," reviewed, 129-131.
Hart, Albert B., "America at war," reviewed, 404; "New American history," reviewed, 598-599; "School history of the United States," reviewed, 146.
Hasbrouck, Louise S., "Mexico," reviewed, 436-437.
HAY, THOMAS R., *The south and the arming of the slaves*, 34-73.
Haynes, Fred E., "James Baird Weaver," reviewed, 592-593.
HENDERSON, ARCHIBALD, *Isaac Shelby and the Genet mission*, 451-469.
Hershey, Amos S. and Susanne W. Hershey, "Modern Japan," reviewed, 437-439.
HICKS, JOHN D., (R) Willard's "The Union colony at Greeley, Colorado," 426-427.
"Highways and byways of Florida," by Clifton Johnson, reviewed, 124.
HILL, JOSEPH J., (doc.) *An unknown expedition to Santa Fe in 1807*, 560-562.
"Historic shrines of America," by J. T. Faris, reviewed, 275-276.
Historical activities in Canada, 1918-1919, by L. J. Burpee, 236-259; war history, 237-241; acquisition of material, 241-242; bibliographies, guides, and calendars, 242; publication of source material, 243-247; meetings and published transactions, 247-250; periodical literature, 251-252; monographs and general treatises, 252-256; marking of historic sites, 256; ethnological and archaeological work, 256-259.
Historical activities in the old northwest, by A. C. Cole, 74-98; war history organization, 76-78; acquisition of source material, 78-81; publication of source material, 81-83; meetings and published transactions, 83-87; periodical literature, 87-92; monographs and general treatises, 92-96; bibliography, 96-98.
Historical activities in the trans-Mississippi northwest, 1917-1919, by J. C. Parish, 360-380; progress and activities of historical societies, 360-363;

war history activities, 364-366; publications of societies, 366-372; other publications, 372-377; acquisition of materials, 377-379; celebrations and marking of sites, 379-380.
"Historical geography of Detroit," by A. E. Parkins, reviewed, 423.
"History of early relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844," by K. S. Latourette, reviewed, 111-112.
"History of Indiana from 1850 to the present," by Logan Esarey, reviewed, 131-133.
"History of Latin America," by W. W. Sweet, reviewed, 432-435.
"History of Spain," by C. E. Chapman, reviewed, 269-271.
"History of suffrage in the United States," by Kirk Porter, reviewed, 114-115.
"History of the civil war," by J. F. Rhodes, reviewed, 280-281.
"History of the state of Idaho," by C. J. Brosnan, reviewed, 427.
"History of the United States," by Cecil Chesterton, reviewed, 407.
"History of the United States," by J. H. Latané, reviewed, 144-145.
Hobson, Elsie G., "Educational legislation and administration in the state of New York from 1777 to 1850," reviewed, 586-587.
HOCKETT, HOMER C., (R) Cole's "The era of the civil war, 1848-1870," 135-137.
Horner, John B., "Oregon," reviewed, 594-596.
Hough, Emerson, "The passing of the frontier," reviewed, 138-141.
Howe, Frederic C., "The only possible peace," reviewed, 402-403.
Howe, M. A. DeWolfe, "The Atlantic monthly and its makers," reviewed, 275.
"Hudson, Dutch and English on the," by M. W. Goodwin, reviewed, 420.
"Idaho, History of the state of," by C. J. Brosnan, reviewed, 427.
"Idealism and the modern age," by G. P. Adams, reviewed, 274-275.
"Illinois one hundred years ago, Pictures of," by M. M. Quaife, reviewed, 286-287.
[Illinois] "The era of the civil war, 1848-1870," by A. C. Cole, reviewed, 135-137.
[Illinois] "The frontier state, 1818-1848," by T. C. Pease, reviewed, 133-135.
"In the Alaskan wilderness," by G. B. Gordon, reviewed, 142-144.
"Indiana, History of, from 1850 to the present," by Logan Esarey, reviewed, 131-133.
Indians, The United States factory system for trading with the, 1796-1822, by R. B. Way, 220-235.
"Industry and trade," by A. L. Bishop, reviewed, 407-408.
"International war, its causes and its cure," by O. T. Crosby, reviewed, 290-291.
"Introduction to the study of the government of modern states," by W. F. Willoughby, reviewed, 268.
"Iowa, Legal and political status of women in," by R. A. Gallaher, reviewed, 423-425.
Isaac Shelby and the Genet mission, by Archibald Henderson, 451-469; feeling in Kentucky against Spain, 451; Genet's machinations, 452-455; St. Clair's attitude, 455; Shelby's attitude, 456-458; public opinion in Kentucky, 458-460; letter of Shelby to secretary of state, 461-462; Clark's "Proposals," 463; Shelby's attitude interpreted, 464; results of Shelby's conduct, 465-469.
Isthmus of Tehuantepec, Diplomacy of the United States and Mexico regarding, by J. F. Rippy, 503-531.
"James Baird Weaver," by F. E. Haynes, reviewed, 592-593.
JAMES, JAMES A., (R) Sauer, Cady, and Cowles, "Starved Rock state park and its environs," 137.
"Japan, Short history of," by E. W. Clement, reviewed, 437-439.
"Japan and world peace," by K. K. Kawakami, reviewed, 437-439.
"Japan, Modern," by A. S. and S. W. Hershey, reviewed, 437-439.
Jastrow, Morris, "War and the coming peace," reviewed, 152-153.
Johnson, Clifton, "Highways and byways of Florida," reviewed, 124.
Jordan, David S., "Democracy and world relations," reviewed, 399-401.
JORDAN, HENRY D., *Daniel Wolsey Voorhees*, 532-555.
Journalists, The khaki, 1917-1919, by A. M. Schlesinger, 350-359.
Kalaw, Maximo M., "Self-government in the Philippines," reviewed, 565-567.
Kasson, John A., "Evolution of the constitution of the United States of America and history of the Monroe doctrine," reviewed, 576-577.
Kawakami, K. K., "Japan and world peace," reviewed, 437-439.
KELLAR, HERBERT A., (R) Leupp's "George Westinghouse," 283-284.
KELLOGG, LOUISE P., (R) Canby and Brooke's "War aims and peace ideals," 572-573.
Kenamore, Claire, "From Vauquois hill to Exermont," reviewed, 593-594.

Kent, Raymond A., "A study of state aid to public schools in Minnesota," reviewed, 425-426.
"Kino's historical memoir of Pimeria Alta," by H. E. Bolton, reviewed, 428-429.
KULL, IRVING S., (R) Abbott's "Colonel John Scott of Long Island, 1634(?)-1696," 285.
Laski, Harold J., "Authority in the modern state," reviewed, 569.
Latané, John H., "History of the United States," reviewed, 144-145.
"Latin America, History of," by W. W. Sweet, reviewed, 432-435.
Latourette, Kenneth S., "History of early relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844," reviewed, 111-112.
Lavell, Cecil F., "Reconstruction and national life," reviewed, 573-574.
"Legal and political status of women in Iowa," by R. A. Gallaher, reviewed, 423-425.
"Lemuel Shaw," by F. H. Chase, reviewed, 584-585.
Leonard, Lewis A., "Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton," reviewed, 286.
LESCOHIER, D. D., (R) Friedman's "American problems of reconstruction," 116-117.
"Letters of Susan Hale," by C. P. Atkinson, reviewed, 585.
Leupp, Francis E., "George Westinghouse," reviewed, 283-284.
LIBBY, O. G., (R) Densmore's "Teton Sioux music," 141-142.
LIBMAN, ANITA, (R) Merrill's "A college man in khaki," 152.
"Life and times of Stephen Girard," by J. B. McMaster, reviewed, 120.
"Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton," by L. A. Leonard, reviewed, 286.
"Life of John Marshall," by A. J. Beveridge, reviewed, 581-584.
"Life of Lieutenant General Chaffee," by W. H. Carter, reviewed, 281-282.
LINDLEY, HARLOW, *Western travel, 1800-1820*, 167-191.
LINGLEY, CHARLES R., (R) Purcell's "Connecticut in transition, 1775-1818," 118-119.
LONN, ELLA, *The French council of commerce in relation to American trade*, 192-219.
Louisiana, Financial reports relating to (doc.), by C. H. Cunningham, 381-397.
MacElroy, Mary H., "Work and play in colonial days," reviewed, 147.
MCGRANE, R. C., (R) Corning's "Hamilton Fish," 282.
MacKaye, Percy, "Washington," reviewed, 418.
McLaughlin, Andrew C., "America and Britain," reviewed, 268-269.
McMaster, John B., "Life and times of Stephen Girard," reviewed, 120.
Macy, Jesse, "The anti-slavery crusade," reviewed, 416-417.
"Marshall, John, Life of," by A. J. Beveridge, reviewed, 581-584.
MARSHALL, T. M., (R) Wren's "Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1918," 587-588.
Means, Philip A., "Racial factors in democracy," reviewed, 403.
MERENESS, NEWTON D., (R) Leonard's "Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton," 286.
Meriwether, Lee, "The war diary of a diplomat," reviewed, 293.
Merrill, Wainwright, "A college man in khaki," reviewed, 152.
Merriman, Roger B., "Rise of the Spanish empire in the old world and in the new," reviewed, 564-565.
"Mexico," by L. S. Hasbrouck, reviewed, 436-437.
Mexico, Diplomacy of the United States and, regarding the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, by J. F. Rippy, 503-531.
"Mexico today and tomorrow," by E. D. Trowbridge, reviewed, 436-437.
"Mexico under Carranza," by T. E. Gibbon, reviewed, 436-437.
"Mexico's dilemma," by Carl Ackerman, reviewed, 112.
"Michigan, Political parties in, 1837-1860," by F. B. Streeter, reviewed, 127-129.
"Minnesota, A study of state aid to public schools in," by R. A. Kent, reviewed, 425-426.
Minor, Raleigh C., "A republic of nations," reviewed, 399-401.
"Mississippi, Official and statistical register of the state of," by Dunbar Rowland, reviewed, 125-126.
"Mississippi, Publications of the historical society of, "by Dunbar Rowland, reviewed, 126.
"Modern Japan," by A. S. and S. W. Hershey, reviewed, 437-439.
Moore, Ernest C., "What the war teaches about education," reviewed, 292-293.
Moore, William H., "The clash," reviewed, 430.
MORAN, THOMAS F., (R) Hart's "America at war," 404.
Munro, William B., "The government of the United States," reviewed, 278-280.
MYERS, WILLIAM S., (R) Howe's "The only possible peace, 402-403.
"National governments and the world war," by F. A. Ogg, reviewed, 147-148.
"Naval power in the war," by C. C. Gill, reviewed, 151.

"New American history," by A. B. Hart, reviewed, 598-599.
New light on Don Diego de Peñalosa: proof that he never made an expedition from Santa Fe to Quivira and the Mississippi river in 1662, by C. W. Hackett, 313-335; Peñalosa's proposals to Louis XIV, 313-314; historians' attitude toward the Freytas "Relacion," 314-317; Bandelier transcripts shed new light on question, 317; Mendizábal governor of New Mexico, 318; Peñalosa appointed to succeed him, 319; relations between Mendizábal and Peñalosa, 320-322; attitude of Freytas, 322-323; Peñalosa's expedition to Moqui, 323; conflict with Posadas, 324-330; Peñalosa leaves New Mexico, 331; trial before tribunal of the inquisition, 331-335.
"New York, Educational legislation and administration in the state of, from 1777 to 1850," by E. G. Hobson, reviewed, 586-587.
Northwest, Historical activities in the old, by A. C. Cole, 74-98.
Northwest, Historical activities in the trans-Mississippi, 1917-1919, by J. C. Parish, 360-380.
"Official and statistical register of the state of Mississippi," by Dunbar Rowland, reviewed, 125-126.
Ogg, Frederick A., "National governments and the world war," reviewed, 147-148; (R) Scott's "The armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800," 277; (R) Scott's "Treaties of 1785, 1799 and 1828 between the United States and Prussia," 276.
"Oregon," by J. B. Horner, reviewed, 594-596.
Orth, Samuel P., "The boss and the machine," reviewed, 417-418.
Osborn, Chase S., "The iron hunter," reviewed, 589-592.
"Our beginnings in Europe and America," by Smith Burnham, reviewed, 598.
"Pacific, The problem of the," by C. B. Fletcher, reviewed, 563.
Page, Edward C., (R) Latané's "History of the United States," 144-145.
Paine, Ralph D., "The old merchant marine," reviewed, 577-578.
Palmer, Frederick, "America in France," reviewed, 149-150.
Parish, John C., *Historical activities in the trans-Mississippi northwest, 1917-1919*, 360-380.
Parkins, Almon E., "Historical geography of Detroit, reviewed, 423.
Paxson, F. L., (R) McMaster's "Life and times of Stephen Girard," 120.
Pease, Theodore C., "The frontier state, 1818-1848," reviewed, 133-135.
Pelzer, Louis, (doc.) *A frontier officer's military order book*, 260-267.
Peñalosa, New light on Don Diego de, by C. W. Hackett, 313-335.
"Philadelphia, The book of," by Robert Shackleton, reviewed, 121.
"Philippines, Self-government in the," by M. M. Kalaw, reviewed, 565-567.
Phillips, Paul C., (R) Brosnan's "History of the state of Idaho," 427.
"Pictures of Illinois one hundred years ago," by M. M. Quaife, reviewed, 286-287.
"Pimeria Alta, Kino's historical memoir of," by H. E. Bolton, reviewed, 428-429.
"Political history of the public lands, 1840-1862," by G. M. Stephenson, reviewed, 414-416.
"Political parties in Michigan, 1837-1860," by F. B. Streeter, reviewed, 127-129.
Porter, Kirk, "History of suffrage in the United States," reviewed, 114-115.
Pottawatomie murders, Bleeding Kansas and the, (doc.) by M. M. Quaife, 556-560.
Potter, Pitman B., (R) Foulke's "Fighting the spoilsmen," 580-581; (R) Lavell's "Reconstruction and national life," 573-574; (R) Wilkinson's "Government and the war," 570-572.
"President Wilson," by Daniel Halévy, reviewed, 419.
Priestley, Herbert I., (R) Horner's "Oregon," 594-596.
"Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1918," by Christopher Wren, reviewed, 587-588.
"Prussia, Treaties of 1785, 1799 and 1828 between the United States and," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 276.
"Public lands, Political history of, 1840-1862," by G. M. Stephenson, 414-416.
"Public life of Zachariah Chandler, 1851-1875," by W. C. Harris, reviewed, 129-131.
"Publications of the Mississippi historical society," by Dunbar Rowland, reviewed, 126.
Purcell, Richard J., "Connecticut in transition, 1775-1818," reviewed, 118-119.
Putnam, George P., "Tabular views of universal history," reviewed, 567.
Quaife, Milo M., (doc.) *Bleeding Kansas and the Pottawatomie murders*, 556-560; (R) Hough's "The passing of the frontier," 138-141; "Pictures of Illinois one hundred years ago," re-

viewed, 286-287; (R) White's "The forty-niners," 138-141.
"Racial factors in democracy," by P. A. Means, reviewed, 403.
RAMMELKAMP, C. H., (R) Goodwin's "Dutch and English on the Hudson," 420.
"Randolph-Macon college, The John P. Branch historical papers of," by C. H. Ambler, reviewed, 123.
RAPER, CHARLES L., (R) Willoughby's "Government organization in war time and after," 570.
RAY, P. ORMAN, (R) West's "Federal power: its growth and necessity," 113-114.
"Reconstruction and national life," by C. F. Lavell, reviewed, 573-574.
Rhodes, James F., "History of the civil war," reviewed, 280-281.
Richman, Irving B., "The Spanish conquerors," reviewed, 430-431.
RIPPY, J. FRED, *Diplomacy of the United States and Mexico regarding the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, 1848-1860*, 503-531.
"Rise of the Spanish-American republics," by W. S. Robertson, reviewed, 272-274.
"Rise of the Spanish empire in the old world and in the new," by R. B. Merriman, reviewed, 564-565.
ROBERTSON, WILLIAM S., (R) Merriman's "Rise of the Spanish empire in the old world and in the new," 564-565; (R) Richman's "The Spanish conquerors," 430-431; "Rise of the Spanish-American republics," reviewed, 272-274.
Robinson, Luther E., "Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters," reviewed, 586.
Rolland, Romain, "Above the battle," reviewed, 294.
ROOT, W. T., (R) MacElroy's "Work and play in colonial days," 147.
ROSS, EDWARD A., (R) Means' "Racial factors in democracy, 403.
Rowland, Dunbar, "Official and statistical register of the state of Mississippi," reviewed, 125-126; "Publications of the Mississippi historical society," reviewed, 126.
Sanford, Albert H., "Story of agriculture in the United States," reviewed, 599-600.
Santa Fe, An unknown expedition to, in 1807, (doc.) by J. J. Hill, 560-562.
"Santo Domingo," by Otto Schoenrich, reviewed, 113.
Sauer, Cady, and Cowles, "Starved Rock state park and its environs," reviewed, 137.
SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR M., (R) Paine's "The old merchant marine," 577-578; *The khaki journalists, 1917-1919*, 350-359.
SCHMIDT, LOUIS B., (R) Sanford's "Story of agriculture in the United States," 599-600; (R) Stephenson's "Political history of the public lands, 1840-1862," 414-416.
Schoenrich, Otto, "Santo Domingo," reviewed, 113.
"School history of the United States," by A. B. Hart, reviewed, 146.
"Scott, Colonel John, of Long Island, 1634(?)-1696," by W. C. Abbott, reviewed, 285.
Scott, James B., "The armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800," reviewed, 277.
Scott, James B., "Treaties of 1785, 1799 and 1828 between the United States and Prussia," reviewed, 276.
"Self-government in the Philippines," by M. M. Kalaw, reviewed, 565-567.
Shackleton, Robert, "The book of Philadelphia," reviewed, 121.
"Shaw, Lemuel," by F. H. Chase, reviewed, 584-585.
SHIPPEE, LESTER B., *Steamboating on the upper Mississippi after the civil war: a Mississippi magnate*, 470-502; (R) Streeter's "Political parties in Michigan, 1837-1860," 127-129.
"Short history of Japan," by E. W. Clement, reviewed, 437-439.
Simpson, Mabel E., "Supervised study in American history," reviewed, 146.
Slaves, The south and the arming of the, by T. R. Hay, 34-73.
"Social history of the American family," by A. W. Calhoun, reviewed, 408-409.
"Social studies of the war," by E. T. Clark, reviewed, 574-575.
"South America, Understanding," by C. S. Cooper, reviewed, 435-436.
"South and Central American trade conditions of today," by A. H. Verrill, reviewed, 435-436.
South Carolina, Bluffton movement in, and the annexation of Texas, by C. S. Boucher, 3-33.
"South, The truth about lynching and the negro in the," by W. H. Collins, reviewed, 124-125.
"Spain, History of," by C. E. Chapman, reviewed, 269-271.
"Spanish-American republics, Rise of the," by W. S. Robertson, reviewed, 272-274.
"Spanish empire, Rise of, in the old world and in the new," by R. B. Merriman, reviewed, 564-565.
Stallybrass, W. T. S., "A society of states," reviewed, 399-401.
Steamboating on the upper Mississippi

after the civil war: a Mississippi magnate, by L. B. Shippee, 470-502; William F. Davidson's advent into the Mississippi steamboating, 470-472; organization of the Northwestern line, 472; monopoly of trade established, 473-474; anti-monopoly agitation begun, 474-479; the anti-monopoly convention, 480-487; Northwestern Union packet company organized, 488-490; Davidson's advent into lower river trade, 491-492; Keokuk and Northern line packet company organized, 494-496; losing fight of steamboats with railroads, 497-500; the Diamond Jo line, 500-501; estimate of Davidson, 501-502.

Stephenson, George M., "Political history of the public lands, 1840-1862," reviewed, 414-416.

STEVENS, JAMES G., (R) Calhoun's "Social history of the American family," 408-409; (R) Moore's "The clash," 430; (R) Wellman's "The force supreme," 402.

STEVENS, WAYNE E., (R.) Davidson's "The North West company," 411-414.

"Story of agriculture in the United States," by A. H. Sanford, reviewed, 599-600.

Streeter, Floyd B., "Political parties in Michigan, 1837-1860," reviewed, 127-129.

Sublette, Fragmentary journal of William L. (doc.), by H. C. Dale, 99-110.

"Supervised study in American history," by M. E. Simpson, reviewed, 146.

Sweet, William W., "History of Latin America," reviewed, 432-435.

SWIFT, FLETCHER H., (R) Kent's "A study of state aid to public schools in Minnesota," 425-426.

"Tabular views of universal history," by G. P. Putnam, reviewed, 567.

Tead, Ordway, "The people's part in peace," reviewed, 399-401.

"Teton Sioux music," by Frances Densmore, reviewed, 141-142.

Texas, The annexation of, and the Bluffton movement in South Carolina, by C. S. Boucher, 3-33.

"The American Indian as participant in the civil war," by A. H. Abel, reviewed, 578-579.

The annexation of Texas and the Bluffton movement in South Carolina, by C. S. Boucher, 3-33; Calhoun's efforts to reform national democratic organization, 4-9; state rights democrats in South Carolina, 10-12; South Carolina favors annexation of Texas, 13; relation to slavery question, 14; Calhoun's efforts for annexation, 15; whigs' attitude on, 16; Rhett organizes Bluffton movement, 17-21; attitude toward Polk, 22; talk of dissolution of the union, 23-27; Hoar affair, 27; South Carolina legislature's attitude toward slavery issue, 28-33.

"The anti-slavery crusade," by Jesse Macy, reviewed, 416-417.

"The armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 277.

"The Atlantic monthly and its makers," by M. A. D. Howe, reviewed, 275.

"The book of Philadelphia," by Robert Shackleton, reviewed, 121.

"The boss and the machine," by S. P. Orth, reviewed, 417-418.

"The clash," by W. H. Moore, reviewed, 430.

"The cotton kingdom," by W. E. Dodd, reviewed, 421-422.

"The county," by H. S. Gilbertson, reviewed, 117.

"The dramatic story of Old Glory," by Samuel Abbott, reviewed, 600.

"The economic foundations of peace," by J. L. Garvin, reviewed, 288-290.

"The era of the civil war, 1848-1870," by A. C. Cole, reviewed, 135-137.

"The fathers of New England," by C. M. Andrews, reviewed, 284-285.

"The force supreme," by Walter Wellman, reviewed, 402.

"The forty-niners," by S. E. White, reviewed, 138-141.

The French council of commerce in relation to American trade, by Ella Lonn, 192-219; origin and organization of the council, 192-196; ports participating in colonial commerce, 198-202; duties, 202-210; French attitude toward foreign participation in her trade, 210-216; intercolonial trade encouraged, 216; protection of French manufactures, 216; protection given colonists, 217-218.

"The frontier state, 1818-1848," by T. C. Pease, reviewed, 133-135.

"The government of the United States," by W. B. Munro, reviewed, 278-280.

"The iron hunter," by Chase S. Osborn, reviewed, 589-592.

"The John P. Branch historical papers of Randolph-Macon college," by C. H. Ambler, reviewed, 123.

The khali journalists, 1917-1919, by A. M. Schlesinger, 350-359; importance in the war, 350; origin of soldier press, 351-352; *Trench and camp* chain, 352-353; other strong papers, 353-355; service to the soldiers, 356-357; humorous and pictorial papers, 357; overseas newspapers, 357-359.

The last meeting of the confederate cabinet, by James E. Walmsley, 336-349;

the last meeting at Richmond, 336-337; sojourn of cabinet in Danville, 337-339; at Greensboro, 339-340; journey to Charlotte, 341-343; meeting at Fort Mill, 343-344; conference at Abbeville, 344-345; break-up of cabinet party at Washington, 345-346; question as to what constitutes a cabinet meeting, 346-349.

"The Maseres letters, 1766-1768," by W. S. Wallace, reviewed, 596-597.

"The mastery of the far east," by A. J. Brown, reviewed, 437-439.

"The Maya Indians of southern Yucatan and northern British Honduras," by T. W. F. Gann, reviewed, 431.

"The new America," by Frank Dilnot, reviewed, 269.

"The North West company," by G. C. Davidson, reviewed, 411-414.

"The old merchant marine," by R. D. Paine, reviewed, 577-578.

"The only possible peace," by F. C. Howe, reviewed, 402-403.

"The passing of the frontier," by Emerson Hough, reviewed, 138-141.

"The people's part in peace," by Ordway Tead, reviewed, 399-401.

"The president's control of foreign relations," by E. S. Corwin, reviewed, 407.

"The problem of the Pacific," by C. B. Fletcher, reviewed, 563.

"The quit-rent system in the American colonies," by B. W. Bond, reviewed, 410-411.

"The responsible state," by F. H. Giddings, reviewed, 399-401.

"The royal government in Virginia, 1624-1775," by P. S. Flippin, reviewed, 122.

The south and the arming of the slaves, by T. R. Hay, 34-73; early suggestions for using negroes as soldiers, 36-38; necessity for recruits, 39-40; Cleburne's proposal, 41-44; attitude of officials toward, 45-47; popular attitude, 48; increasing need for men, 50-52; opposition to use of negroes, 53-54; administration comes to favor policy, 54-56; contest in congress on question, 56-59; attitude of Virginia and of General Lee, 60-62; continued opposition, 63-64; congressional action, 64-67; action of Virginia legislature, 67-68; act passed by congress, 68-70; attempts to recruit negroes, 70-73.

"The Spanish conquerors," by I. B. Richman, reviewed, 430-431.

"The truth about lynching and the negro in the south," by W. H. Collins, reviewed, 124-125.

"The Union colony at Greeley, Colorado," by J. F. Willard, reviewed, 426-427.

The United States factory system for trading with the Indians, 1796-1822, by R. B. Way, 220-235; French trade with Indians, 220; British and Spanish trade, 221-222; beginnings of United States' Indian trade, 223; establishment of government factories, 224; rivalry with British traders, 225-227; difficulties of factory system, 228-229; opposition of private traders, 229-230; fight in congress on question, 231-234; abolition of factory system, 234.

"The war and education," by A. F. West, reviewed, 292-293.

"The war diary of a diplomat," by Lee Meriwether, reviewed, 293.

"The world war and leadership in a democracy," by R. T. Ely, reviewed, 399-401.

THOMAS, DAVID Y., (R) Crosby's "International war, its causes and its cure," 290-291; (R) Garvin's "The economic foundations of peace," 288-290; (R) Gompers' "American labor and the war," 291-292; (R) Ogg's "National governments and the world war, 147-148.

THOMPSON, J. J., (R) Balch's "A world court in the light of the United States supreme court," 398-399.

TILTON, LEILA W., (R) Quaife's "Pictures of Illinois one hundred years ago," 286-287.

TREAT, PAYSON J., (R) Brown's "The mastery of the far east," 437-439; (R) Clement's "Short history of Japan," 437-439; (R) Hershey's "Modern Japan," 437-439; (R) Kawakami's "Japan and world peace," 437-439; (R) Latourette's "History of early relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844," 111-112.

"Treaties of 1785, 1799 and 1828 between the United States and Prussia," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 276.

Trowbridge, E. D., "Mexico today and tomorrow," reviewed, 436-437.

"Understanding South America," by C. S. Cooper, reviewed, 435-436.

"United States supreme court, A world court in the light of the," by T. W. Balch, reviewed, 398-399.

Verrill, A. Hyatt, "South and Central American trade conditions of today," reviewed, 435-436.

VIOLETTE, E. M., (R) Hart's "New American history, 598-599; (R) Woodburn's "Elementary American history and government," 288.

"Virginia, The royal government in,

1624-1775,'' by P. S. Flippin, reviewed, 122.
''Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688,'' by T. J. Wertenbaker, reviewed, 589.
Voorhees, Daniel Wolsey, by H. D. Jordan, 532-555.
Wallace, W. Stewart, ''The Maseres letters, 1766-1768,'' reviewed, 596-597.
WALMSLEY, JAMES E., *The last meeting of the confederate cabinet*, 336-349.
''War aims and peace ideals,'' by H. S. Canby and Tucker Brooke, reviewed, 572-573.
''War and the coming peace,'' by Morris Jastrow, reviewed, 152-153.
WARD, HENRY B., (R) Gordon's ''In the Alaskan wilderness,'' 142-144.
''Washington,'' by Percy MacKaye, reviewed, 418.
WATKINS, GORDON S., (R) Bishop's ''Industry and trade,'' 407-408.
WAY, ROYAL B., *The United States factory system for trading with the Indians, 1796-1822*, 220-235.
WEBSTER, H. J., (R) Carter's ''Life of Lieutenant General Chaffee,'' 281-282.
Wellman, Walter, ''The force supreme,'' reviewed, 402.
Wertenbaker, Thomas J., ''Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688,'' reviewed, 589.
West, Andrew F., ''The war and education,'' reviewed, 292-293.
West, Henry L., ''Federal power: its growth and necessity,'' reviewed, 113-114.
Western travel, 1800-1820, by Harlow Lindley, 167-191; movement of settlers west of the Alleghanies, 167-170; Louisiana purchase, 170-171; early fur trade and exploration west of the Mississippi river, 172-174; settlement in Missouri, 175-177; Manuel Lisa, 177-178; other early explorers, 178-180; expedition of Bradbury, 180; expedition of Brackenridge and Lisa, 180-181; Wilson Hunt's expedition, 181-184; Joseph Miller, James Bird, Gabriel Franchère, 184-185; Schoolcraft's travels, 185-186; exploration in the southwest: Lalande, 186-187; Purcell, 187; Chouteau and De Munn, 188; Becknell, 189; McKnight and Baird, 189; Thomas Nuttall, 189-190.
''Westinghouse, George,'' by F. E. Leupp, reviewed, 283-284.
''What the war teaches about education,'' by E. C. Moore, reviewed, 292-293.
White, Stewart E., ''The forty-niners,'' reviewed, 138-141.
Wilkinson, Spenser, ''Government and the war,'' reviewed, 570-572.
Willard, James F., ''The Union colony at Greeley, Colorado,'' reviewed, 426-427.
Willoughby, William F., ''Government organization in war time and after,'' reviewed, 570; ''Introduction to the study of the government of modern states,'' reviewed, 568.
''Wilson, President,'' by Daniel Halévy, reviewed, 419.
Woodburn, James A., ''Elementary American history and government,'' reviewed, 288.
Woodruff, Clinton R., ''A new municipal program,'' reviewed, 575-576.
''Work and play in colonial days,'' by M. H. MacElroy, reviewed, 147.
Wren, Christopher, ''Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1918,'' reviewed, 587-588.
''Wyoming historical and geological society, Proceedings and collections for the year 1918,'' by Christopher Wren, reviewed, 587-588.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE STATE UNIVERSITY

URBANA

EDMUND J. JAMES, PH. D., LL. D., President (*on leave*)
DAVID KINLEY, PH. D., LL. D., Acting President

The University includes the following departments:

The Graduate School

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (Ancient and Modern Languages and Literatures; History, Political Science, Sociology; Philosophy, Psychology, Education; Mathematics; Astronomy; Geology; Physics; Chemistry; Botany, Zoology, Entomology; Physiology; Art and Design)

The College of Commerce and Business Administration (General Business, Banking, Insurance, Accounting, Railway Administration and Transportation, Foreign Commerce, Commercial and Civic Secretarial Service, Commercial Teaching, Industrial Administration, Commerce and Law)

The College of Education (General Education; Athletic Coaching and Physical Education; Industrial Education; Agricultural and Home-Economics Education)

The College of Engineering (Architecture; Architectural, Ceramic, Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, Mining, Municipal and Sanitary, and Railway Engineering)

The College of Agriculture (Agronomy; Animal Husbandry; Dairy Husbandry; Horticulture, Floriculture, and Landscape Gardening; Veterinary Science; Agricultural Extension; Teachers' Course; Home Economics)

The College of Law (three years' course and four years' course)

The Curriculum in Journalism

The Curriculums in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering

The School of Railway Engineering and Administration

The School of Music (four years' course)

The School of Library Science (two years' course)

The College of Medicine (in Chicago)

The College of Dentistry (in Chicago)

The School of Pharmacy (in Chicago; Ph. G. and Ph. C. courses)

The Summer Session (eight weeks)

Experiment Stations: U. S. Agricultural Experiment Station; Engineering Experiment Station; Natural History Survey; Biological Experiment Station on Illinois River; State Water Survey; State Geological Survey.

The library collections contain (Jan. 1, 1920) 463,614 volumes, including the library of the Natural History Survey, the Quine Medical Library, and the library of the School of Pharmacy.

For catalogs and information address

THE REGISTRAR,
Urbana, Illinois

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. VI, No. 1 JUNE, 1919

THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS AND THE BLUFFTON MOVEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The history of ante bellum South Carolina is marked by successive waves of popular excitement. At times a lull came between two periods of high feeling, but at other times no sooner would one issue be adjusted, at least temporarily, than another would be ready to take its place. The state seemed doomed to almost perpetual agitation, and as a matter of fact there was seldom the lack of local division of opinion and party strife which it has too frequently been asserted was the condition politically in the ante bellum period. No single subject was responsible for the intermittent feverish condition of the body politic, but the list of issues, both national and local, spread over a wide range.[1]

Of the number of issues which may be said to have caused distinct waves of agitation and to have reached a fairly definite climax, it is the purpose of this monograph to present the controversy which centers around the annexation of Texas, particularly as it appeared in the presidential campaign of 1844.

During the period of excitement caused by the presentation of antislavery petitions to congress, Calhoun had endeavored to secure the establishment of the principle that congress was not to entertain the slavery issue in any form. He had met with some degree of success, though many South Carolinians, including some of his colleagues in congress, thought that he was not pursuing the wisest policy. As a result of the appearance of

[1] For a list of these issues, see Chauncey S. Boucher, "South Carolina and the south on the eve of secession, 1852 to 1860," in *Washington university studies*, 4: no. 2: 83.

various phases of the national financial issue connected with the panic of 1837 and the general condition of political parties in the late thirties and early forties, Calhoun came to believe that with proper southern and some northern support he could obtain security for the south on all issues — slavery, the tariff, and other questions — by a reform of the democratic party on the basis of state rights versus consolidationism. By refusing to be blind followers of the democratic organization, that is, by judiciously supporting the democrats only when their policy seemed based on principles which the state rights democrats of the south considered sound, Calhoun felt that he and his group could, through control of the democratic party, eventually accomplish a thorough reform of the administration of the national government and bring it back to the basic principles which had been held by sound-minded statesmen at the time of the framing and adoption of the constitution. Perhaps the position of the south could be made doubly secure by his own election to the presidency; in the mind of Calhoun, however, no matter what may have been said by his political opponents in or out of South Carolina, reform of the administration was the most important thing for which he worked, and not his elevation to the presidency — the latter would have been simply a happy, and of course welcome, guaranty of the former.

Early in 1843 it was seen by the South Carolina democrats that the northern democratic leaders were planning to hold the national convention at a very early date and have it proceed according to a slate prepared by them, with little consideration for Calhoun. This would mean not simply failure to secure the nomination of Calhoun for the presidency, but defeat of the principles dear to him and his followers. Accordingly, the South Carolina democrats began a campaign for reform in the organization of the national convention to make it more expressive of the popular will. Thus began a split in the democratic party, between the Van Buren, old-style convention faction, and the Calhoun, reform convention faction — a split which the whigs were delighted to see and did their best to promote.[2]

On March 11 the democratic state rights party held a meeting in Charleston "to take into consideration the nomination of a

[2] *Charleston Mercury*, January 25, 28, February 10, 1843.

candidate for the presidency of the United States at the ensuing election; and also consider the principles on which a National Convention should be organized, and delegates selected to attend the same.'' Resolutions were passed declaring that they would submit to the choice of a national convention only if ''properly and fairly organized,'' with reforms in representation and the method of voting. They insisted, also, that it should not meet until after congress had convened and the parties had indicated the important features of their respective programs. May of 1844 was recommended as the earliest fair time. Party members in the various states were urged to take steps to organize a convention on this basis, and committees were appointed to stimulate action in the congressional districts.[3] In the next three months numerous district and parish meetings adopted resolutions regarding the national convention much like those of the Charleston meeting, and a state convention was promoted to give more official utterance to these doctrines.

The Virginia politicians were active at the same time, and a meeting was held at Richmond which expressed entirely different views as to the time and plan of organization of the national convention. The Richmond group, which was held by South Carolina to be entirely subservient to Van Buren, recommended November of 1843 as the time for the convention. The South Carolinians answered that surely the south could not be cajoled into the support of any candidate, no matter what he promised, until congress had met and he and his men had shown by *votes* that they sincerely opposed the ''black tariff,'' for the relief of the south. The tariffs of 1828 and 1842 had taught the lesson that pledges were worth nothing. Again, as to organization, the delegates from each state should not exceed the number of its votes in the electoral college, and they should vote per capita. To multiply that number by five, as the Richmond crowd had suggested, would be to make an unwieldy body, within the control of cliquish intrigue and dictation; further, it would unjustly increase the influence of the larger and central states, and destroy the influence of the small states and of the southern and southwestern states, because it would be impracticable for some of these to send so many delegates. The plan of the large

[3] *Ibid.*, March 13, 1843.

convention, held early, would mean a death blow to both popular and state rights. It was strange, they felt, that Virginia should be a party to such a suggestion. As to the vote per capita, that was necessary to protect the minorities in the states, whose number might bulk large in the whole country. South Carolina would not object to vote by states, if each gave one vote, but she would not submit to vote by states, with each state voting its whole delegation as the majority of that state, however slight, might dictate.[4]

At Columbia, South Carolina, on May 22 there was held a state democratic convention to give official utterance to the views of the state on the national convention, already expressed in local meetings. The three points insisted upon were a late date, the district system (one from each congressional district elected by the people, and two from the state at large selected by a state legislative party caucus or state convention), and vote per capita. The Carolina state rights watchwords were again proclaimed to be "free trade, low duties, no debt, separation from banks, economy, retrenchment, and strict adherence to the Constitution."[5] Although Calhoun was boomed for the presidency by each and all of these meetings, it was insisted by the press that the participants were not the political tools of Calhoun. The great object, it was maintained, was still the promotion of the great Carolina state rights doctrines, and they would not swerve one jot or tittle from these to conciliate any faction in order to gain support for Calhoun. They would have him president with all of his and the party's old principles, or not at all.[6]

[4] *Charleston Mercury*, March, April and May, 1843. Calhoun was most bitter and determined against the convention system as it existed, and believed that the New York politicians and Ritchie, the Richmond politician and editor, were responsible for the betrayal of Virginia and the south involved in the Richmond plan. He felt that the south should make the adjustment of the tariff on strictly revenue principles a *sine qua non*, for reform of the government was impossible so long as duties were laid for protection. Now, if the Van Buren men were allowed to control the convention and gain the presidential nomination before forced to show their hands on the tariff, that part of the democratic party would again betray the south on the tariff, as it had done in 1828 and 1842. Various letters by Calhoun in March, April, May, and June, 1803, *Calhoun correspondence*, edited by J. Franklin Jameson (American historical association, *Annual report*, 1899, v. 2 — Washington, 1900).

[5] *Pendleton Messenger*, April 14, 21, May 19, June 2, 1843; *Charleston Mercury*, May 26, July, August, 1843; *Niles' Weekly Register*, June 3, 17, 1843.

[6] *Pendleton Messenger*, February 3, 1843; *Charleston Mercury*, February 8, 1843.

The Van Buren men, because a majority of the states seemed against them, finally yielded their date of November, 1843, for the Carolina date, May, 1844. Calhoun was elated at this, and hoped, by a similar expression of opinion from a majority of the states, to secure the adoption of the convention reforms, which he deemed absolutely necessary to the cause of the south. Accordingly, he and South Carolina kept up the campaign for the reforms. To this end funds were sent to Washington to aid in establishing a more efficient party press; and an active Calhoun party was also at work in New York City.[7]

The few whigs of the state, meanwhile, were assuming a unique position. When Clay was on his southern trip, the Charleston whigs invited him to visit the city on his way north. Though he returned north by a different route and could not accept the invitation, the fact that it was issued caused some comment. The whigs of South Carolina claimed that they too, with the rest of the state, would support Calhoun, and that Clay had no intention of trying to draw this state away from Calhoun; his visit was to have been simply that of a private and prominent citizen of the country. All this time, however, the whigs contemplated the contingency, which they considered not a very remote one, that the "tricks and jugglery of a certain northern magician" might sidetrack Calhoun for Van Buren. In that event the whigs hoped to carry South Carolina for Clay in preference to Van Buren.[8]

[7] *Ibid.*, September 11; several letters in July, August, and September, 1843, *Calhoun correspondence; Niles' Weekly Register*, July 29, December 9, 1843.

[8] *Charleston Courier*, January 19, 27, February 11; *Columbia Southern Chronicle*, January 25, 1843. In February of 1843 there came a congressional election, under the new apportionment and redistricting of the state. In only one district of the state did a whig candidate run — the district of Pendleton and Greenville, to which was now added Laurens. Dr. William Butler, the only whig representative from the state in the last congress, had been sent from this district. Even he was not a thorough whig, for he voted with the rest of the state delegation against most of the whig measures. At this election, even though the democrats had two candidates in the field, Butler was defeated. *Pendleton Messenger*, February 17, March 3, 1843; *Greenville Republican*, February 24, 1843.

The South Carolina whigs claimed to be opposed to the tariff and the distribution of the proceeds of the public land sales, and their sole representative in congress had in fact voted against these measures; they professed now to be for Calhoun as first choice for the presidency; they were with the Georgia whigs and the main body of the whigs only in the advocacy of a national bank. This, too, seemed queer, since in 1838 when the independent treasury was agitated, the majority of the South Car-

As the Calhoun supporters began to realize that they could not get their convention reforms accepted, and that under the old plan the convention would be controlled by Van Buren machinery, they found themselves in a perplexing situation. It would almost be worse to have the Van Buren faction in power than the whigs, because the former would barter the interests of the south in the tariff, while if a whig president were elected the democrats would all unite against him.[9] It soon became gen-

olina whig leaders were against a national bank, as well as the independent treasury; the whig representative at the time from the Pendleton and Greenville district, General Waddy Thompson, was for a system of special deposits. The state rights papers now tried to convince the whigs that their present stand for a United States bank was but the pursuance of a phantom, because the stock could not be sold, as Senator Daniel Webster and General James Hamilton both conceded; and the belief that a bank would regulate exchanges between the different sections of the country had been proven to be a delusion. As to the South Carolina whigs' denunciation of the tariff and the distribution, it was feared that this was but feigned, because these measures were so unpopular in South Carolina. *Pendleton Messenger,* January 20, February 10, 17, March 24, June 9, July 7, 1843.

The South Carolina whigs had been in a state of torpor for some time, and an attempt to rouse them to action was made by a call from Spartanburg for a convention to consider state representation in the whig national convention in May at Baltimore. The state rights press welcomed this, because it was felt that there were a number of men in the state who had been regarded as whigs, who had not abandoned their old nullification and state rights principles to the point that they would identify themselves completely with the tariff party, or yield their support to the boasted father of the system. But this attempt at whig revival died when scarcely born, and the whigs rallied to the support of the work of the state democratic convention. This position they held until late in the year, when it seemed that Van Buren would get the democratic nomination. About the middle of November they declared that there was no longer doubt that Calhoun was out of the contest, and Clay would receive their support, even though feeble, against Van Buren and locofocoism. Again a state whig convention was proposed to organize their forces, such as they were. In Charleston a Clay club was organized with officers and committees, and a public address was issued in which the state rights men claimed that the great matters in dispute between the parties were touched with an extremity of caution that showed how hazardous an enterprise the whig gentlemen were aware of having undertaken in venturing to recommend whig principles to the people of South Carolina, for all the strong points of Clay's political system were said to be softened down to a delicate tenuity and shrouded in such a shining mist that they were quite out of sight. *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* April 5, May 31, June 21, July 12, November 1, 22, December 6, 1843; *Pendleton Messenger,* April 14, May 12, July 21, 1843; *Charleston Courier,* May 24, December 12, 1843; *Charleston Mercury,* December 11, 28, 29, 1843.

[9] *Ibid.,* October 7, 1843; *Niles' Weekly Register,* December 9, 1843; Maxcy to Calhoun, December 3; Calhoun to McDuffie, December 4; Rhett to Calhoun, December 8, 1843, *Calhoun correspondence.*

erally known that the next move would be to try to get Calhoun's name withdrawn in such a way as still to leave him available four years hence. There was one possibility, deliberately considered by the Calhoun men: that the Texas question, which would come to an issue in the coming winter, might be so agitated as solidly to unite the slavery section in a manner that might be turned to a political use, and bring the election into the house, where the southern states would not dare to vote for Van Buren or Clay. It would not be wise to attempt to run Calhoun independently of the convention's action unless some such subject, more exciting than the tariff, should create a political explosion, to overcome the prestige and weight of the convention nomination, even in the south. There were even so many southern men who yielded to the doctrine that discrimination for incidental protection might be admitted into a revenue tariff, that a successful rally could not be made against Van Buren on the tariff. The slavery issue, however, might be made to furnish just such an explosion as would unite the whole south. Therefore the leaders, to whom betrayal on the tariff seemed certain ruin, calmly contemplated the use of the slavery issue to unite the south politically. This, it will be noticed, was directly contrary to the generally accepted orthodox southern position of silence on slavery — on that subject the south was to be let distinctly alone; even the discussion of it was not to be permitted.[10]

When, by the middle of December, it had become a certainty that the Van Buren machine would control the convention, even in spite of the belief of Calhoun that three-fourths of the party wished otherwise, the next question became: how could Calhoun and South Carolina save the good old state rights doctrines from meeting utter defeat, just when all had seemed so promising for their success? Calhoun's public address, in which he refused to allow his name to go before the national convention, was therefore important. He again stated clearly his views on the proper organization of a convention; these principles forced him to refuse to permit his name to go before such a convention as it was now determined the Baltimore convention would be.

[19] *Charleston Mercury*, January 11, March 24, November 21, 1843; *Charleston* 19; Calhoun to McDuffie, December 4, 1843, *Calhoun correspondence.*

But did he withdraw his name from the presidential contest entirely, or merely from the democratic convention? Difference of opinion arose over the question. Some held that Calhoun's address, which appeared early in January, no longer left the right to consider him in any way a candidate for the presidency. Others, however, held that the address did not withdraw his name from the presidential race, but simply refused to allow it to be brought before the convention. This latter view, indeed, was in accord with Calhoun's intent at the time. He still hoped that his friends, true to the state rights cause, would cling to him as a candidate, as the only way of maintaining the principles in their purity, saved from the total loss which would result from merging their supporters in the hopelessly corrupt democratic party. Many others of the state rights party, however, were against anything that would estrange them from the regular democratic party, for as the result of a defeat of Van Buren this time, they thought that they could see assurance of the aid of the entire party four years hence.[11]

Certain it was that the position of the South Carolina state rights party was a delicate one. Although professing to be democrats, when they did not now come out openly and strongly for Van Buren, they were accused of desertion of the party. It was intimated rather strongly that disappointment at not being able to secure the nomination of its favorite in the democratic convention was believed to be the only motive for refusing, if South Carolina should do so, to go into that convention.[12] The position which the majority of the state rights party of South Carolina now determined to hold was one of neutrality or independence, in an effort to force the democratic party in congress

[11] *Charleston Mercury*, January 29, February 15, 1844; *Niles' Weekly Register*, February 10, 24, 1844; Calhoun to A. Burt, December 23; Calhoun to Hunter, December 22, 1843; Elmore to Calhoun, January 13; Hunter to Calhoun, January 19; Calhoun to J. E. Calhoun, February 7, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[12] *Charleston Mercury*, January 17, 1844; James Gadsden to Calhoun, January 27, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.* There were yet some sporadic attempts to support Calhoun independently of the convention action, both in Carolina and in New York, but Calhoun now discouraged all these as useless and conducive to discord. Then, too, he was at this time, in March of 1844, so disgusted with the state of both political parties and the fraudulent game of president making, that he declared himself done forever with the political arena. Calhoun to Duff Green, February 10; Calhoun to J. E. Calhoun, February 14; F. Byrdsall to Calhoun, March 18, 1844, *ibid.; Niles' Weekly Register*, March 9, 16, 1844.

to redeem its pledges on the two big questions of the tariff and slavery. They hoped, by offering the democrats support conditional on such action, to succeed. There was talk that South Carolina might even be swung over to the whigs this time, so great was the disgust with the action of the democrats in congress. The democrats had virtually two-thirds of the house of representatives, the largest democratic majority in twenty years, and yet, day after day, they had refused to give any relief from the tariff of 1842, and had struck out the twenty-first rule without furnishing any substitute to protect the south from abolitionist agitation on the floor of congress.[13] The south had looked to the democratic party for soundness and fidelity on the two great points of policy most vital to it: freedom from control in its pursuits of industry and exemption from interference with its peculiar institution. When, instead of being protected, both of these great interests were assailed, who could tell to what new political development this might lead? No wonder the whigs laughed and hoped, even in South Carolina. Therefore, the state rights men declared, it would be time enough for the Van Buren men to ask for support after their pledges were redeemed.[14]

The state rights men of South Carolina hoped that the other southern states would hold a similar position, but soon one state after another began to weaken, to accept Van Buren, and thus show that the "machine was too strong for the cause of truth and merit." Even in South Carolina there appeared a number of men, of whom H. L. Pinckney seemed to be the leader, who were for coming out at once and almost unconditionally for Van Buren. The true state rights men had to use ingenuity to prevent an expression of Van Buren support from South Carolina at this time.[15]

[13] Number twenty-one of the standing rules of the house read: "That no petition, memorial, resolution or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or the slave trade between the States and Territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever." It was adopted in January, 1840, and repealed in December, 1844.

[14] *Charleston Mercury,* January 17, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* January 12, 26, 1844; Calhoun to Hunter, February 1; Calhoun to Green, February 10; Calhoun to Burt, March 9, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[15] Calhoun to Hunter, February 1; Porter to Calhoun, February 5; Seddon to

In order to keep the state rights principles before the country in an uncompromised form, it was now suggested that Calhoun's presence in the senate was necessary. Judge D. E. Huger was ready to resign to give him a seat. Calhoun, however, saw no hope in such a move, for the Van Buren administration would favor the abolitionists and tariff supporters even in spite of pledges, if they could gain votes thereby. The only way the south could influence them would be by showing a united front with a determination to defend its property and safety — a determination as fixed as that of the tariffites and abolitionists to assail them. This, however, he felt was far from realization; his efforts would be vain, for lack of southern support.[16]

As time progressed, and still the democrats did nothing for the south, the South Carolina central democratic committee recommended that South Carolina keep out of the democratic convention and remain unpledged, prepared to act firmly and promptly, when the time came, on the same principles which in 1840 and at other times had governed its conduct, whether in support of those who maintained its creed or in opposition to those who faithlessly abandoned or made war upon it. Though noncommittal as yet, the party proceeded to perfect its organization. "A democratic republican association" was formed in Charleston, with a constitution proclaiming the principles of the address of the democratic convention of 1840, a provision for weekly meetings, a committee of correspondence, and a committee of vigilance to take care of abolitionist interference in the parish of St. Philip and St. Michael. Some of the Van Buren men now tried to get the South Carolina democrats to come out for him who, it then appeared certain, would be the convention's nominee. But in the end South Carolina remained unpledged, and the "little magician" did not receive the nomination.[17]

When a "dark horse," Polk, was nominated by the democratic national convention, the news created a great sensation in South Carolina. It seemed to the state rights men to be a happy escape

Calhoun, February 5; Hunter to Calhoun, February 6; Pickens to Calhoun, March 3, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence; Charleston Mercury*, April 23, 25, 1844.

[16] McDuffie to Calhoun, February 22; Calhoun to Hammond, March 5, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[17] *Charleston Mercury*, March 19, April 9, 11, 23, 25, 1844.

from sure death to the cause of the south. Faces brightened, and congratulations and rejoicing were heard on every side. It was felt that the nomination would command the hearty support of the state, and the principles avowed in the platform were heartily endorsed.[18]

During the last two or three years the abolitionist question, much to the disgust of the south, had intermittently reappeared in congress in the form of petitions and debates on their receipt, yet no very definite issue had been drawn. As Texas became more and more involved with Mexico, however, South Carolina began to express sympathy for Texas to the extent of sending financial aid, raised through voluntary subscriptions, and by 1843 it was clear that the abolitionist question was very likely to become really vital in the case of Texas. The South Carolina legislature of 1843, urged on by the belief that England was about to guarantee independence to Texas, on condition of abolition, passed resolutions that steps should be taken by the United States for the annexation of Texas. As yet, however,

[18] Calhoun to Wharton, July 14, 1844; *Calhoun correspondence; Pendleton Messenger,* June 7; *Charleston Mercury,* June 3, 8, July 31, 1844. Earlier in the year the South Carolina whigs had taken courage from the dissensions among the democrats, and had attempted to perfect their organization, in the hope, the democrats asserted, that the state might be carried for Clay out of disgust. *Ibid.,* January 4; *Pendleton Messenger,* January 5, 1844. The whigs themselves, however, professed to have organized in the state only from a sense of duty and because they deemed it their privilege to be heard, if they could not make themselves felt. They declared that they had no idea of being able to carry the state; the best they could hope for was that, in a contest between Clay and Van Buren, suggestions of consistency and honor might induce the democratic majority to give a neutral vote. In Charleston, Columbia, Cheraw, Pendleton district, and a few other places, Clay clubs appeared. In the spring Clay visited South Carolina and was elaborately entertained in Columbia and Charleston. His speeches on the bank and the tariff were moderated to suit the climate. *Ibid.,* February 3, April 19, 1844; *Charleston Mercury,* April 8; *Charleston Courier,* January 18, March 12, April 8, 10; *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* January 10, 24, 31, February 21, March 27, April 3, May 8, 1844. (In reporting whig victories in other states the editor of the *Columbia Southern Chronicle* headed a column with a cartoon of a coon on a log with his fingers to his nose, saying "Why don't you crow?" to the democratic rooster lying flat on his back on the ground at the feet of the coon.)

The Charleston and Richland Clay clubs appointed delegates to the national whig convention. By this time, due to the importance the Texas question was assuming, the abolitionist question was becoming almost the dominating one in the election, as far as the south was concerned, and the Clay candidates, Clay and Frelinghuysen, came in for much abuse on this score. *Charleston Courier,* April 26, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* May 17; *Charleston Mercury,* April 30, 1844.

South Carolina was not ready to take up the *re*-annexation cry that Texas had been a part of the United States since the purchase of Louisiana, for resolutions to that effect were tabled. The *Charleston Mercury* complained that the people of the north, though ready enough to see the danger of English pressure on the northwest, in Oregon, could not see the even greater danger in the southwest, in Texas. This was all the work of the abolitionists, who, in their great hatred of slavery, would sacrifice any and all interests of the union.[19] It is clear that the Texas movement, as far as South Carolina was concerned, was not a deep-laid slavery-extension plot. Indeed, Texas was ripe and ready for admission before the people of this state gave any attention. The annexation was delayed by abolitionist opposition, rather than hastened and accomplished by proslavery promoters.

When the explosion on the U. S. SS. "Princeton" numbered among its victims the secretary of state, Upshur, and President Tyler offered the position to Calhoun, his friends urgently requested him to accept it because of the delicacy of the Oregon question and especially the Texas question then pending. It was felt that Calhoun was the man best able to accomplish the annexation of Texas. Appeal was made to him to take the post in order to save the union by securing Texas, and also on the score that he would become so popular as a result of the annexation, accomplished by him, that his position for the presidency would be impregnable in 1848. Calhoun finally agreed to accept the position, provided he could resign when the negotiation was completed.[20]

To many southerners the annexation of Texas had become all-essential to the preservation of the union, and, naturally, as the presidential campaign progressed and the Texas question came more to the front, the two became interwoven. When Clay came out against annexation it was pronounced in South Carolina nothing more than was to be expected, in spite of his pretenses

[19] *Charleston Mercury*, January 11, March 24, November 21, 1843; *Charleston Courier*, April 27; *Pendleton Messenger*, February 11, April 1, 1842, and December 29, 1843; *Niles' Weekly Register*, May 14, 1842, December 16, 1843; *Greenville Republican*, April 1, 1842; Duff Green to Calhoun, January 24; Calhoun to Green, April; Calhoun to Hammond, February 2; Green to Calhoun, August 2, 1842, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[20] Several letters in March, 1844, *ibid.*; *Charleston Courier*, March 19, 1844.

toward southern sympathy; but when Van Buren was said to be headed in the same direction, playing to the votes of the abolitionists, there was again talk of a rally around the Calhoun standard, even to the point of disrupting the union. Without Texas, the south was doomed, while out of the union and "with Texas, the slave states would form a territory large enough for a first rate power and one that under a free trade system would flourish beyond any on the Globe — immediately and forever."[21]

By May South Carolina was aroused over the importance of Texas to the point that meetings were held in nearly every district of the state, at which strong resolutions were passed favoring and demanding the annexation. Some of these now spoke of the re-annexation, and tried to show that historically Texas was once a part of the United States. It was felt that if Texas were not annexed *now,* it would be lost to the union forever. It would fall to a dangerous commercial rival—an abolitionist enemy — England. And, further, now was the time for the south to vindicate and save its institutions. The treaty of annexation was then pending in the senate and the meetings in South Carolina were an attempt to prevent its defeat.[22] These annexation meetings were, for the most part, nonpartisan, and were supported by both whigs and state rights democrats.

It has frequently been asserted that of all the valid reasons for the annexation treaty available for presentation to the senate, Calhoun, in his endeavor to gain a point for the south, chose those most debatable, overshot the mark and was to no small degree responsible for the defeat of the treaty; be that as it may, enough members of the senate to defeat the treaty believed that Calhoun was endeavoring to have the annexation designated an act for the protection of slavery. It must be said in Calhoun's defense, however, that one might with sufficient cause take the view that the evidence of an intention by England to interfere in Texas in behalf of abolition was the issue—the concrete evidence of English intentions to establish supremacy in Texas.

[21] *Charleston Mercury,* March 26, April 19, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* May 10, 1844; Calhoun to T. W. Gilmer, December 25, 1843, and several letters in May, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[22] Calhoun to Hammond, May 17, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence; Niles' Weekly Register,* May 18, 25, 1844; *Charleston Mercury,* May 13, 15, June 15, 17, 1844; *Greenville Republican,* May 17, 31, 1844; *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* May 22, 1844.

The necessity of annexation could be proven by this concrete example of English influence and interference in Texas; international dangers were to be avoided and advantages were to be gained. But, in view of the fact that Calhoun had been endeavoring for some time to establish the principle that the federal government was in duty bound to protect the institution of slavery in the states where it existed against attempts at abolition, it was perhaps quite natural that many should pick for emphasis a point which he may not have meant to stress unduly.

Some of the South Carolina whigs continued to oppose annexation even though they admitted that the great majority of the state, including even the districts where the whigs were strongest, were for annexation; they claimed that it would drain South Carolina of the best of its citizens and a large amount of its capital, just as other new southwestern lands had done in the early thirties; and the increased production of cotton, and its consequent reduction in value, would have a disastrous effect on this state. Waddy Thompson was most active against annexation, adding to the above arguments the plea that it would actually promote the abolitionist movement rather than check it, by stimulating added zeal in the northern fanatics, while on the other hand nothing would be gained against abolition by annexation, because he had no fear of an alliance between Texas and England injurious to the United States, nor of abolition in independent Texas; further, it would be a great injustice to Mexican rights. State rights men answered truly, however, that not many years before this same Waddy Thompson had urged the acquisition of Texas as the most effectual, if not the only, means of settling the abolitionist question.[23]

While the majority of the whigs of the state now joined with the democrats in favoring the annexation and the Clay club of Charleston pronounced the question nonpartisan, they would not go to the lengths to which some of the state rights democrats were going in presenting a demand for it, and they objected to the disunion talk that had become quite prevalent in the early summer in connection with this topic. Just before the adjournment of congress Senator Thomas H. Benton of Missouri charged

[23] *Columbia Southern Chronicle*, May 22, 29, 1844; *Charleston Courier*, May 30, July 9, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger*, May 24, 31, June 7, July 26, 1844, August 19, 1836.

Senator George McDuffie of South Carolina with being a leader of a party plotting a dissolution of the union, under the pretext of acquiring Texas, and poured upon him a torrent of invective. Some of the South Carolina whigs claimed that there was indeed too much ground for such a charge both in McDuffie's conduct and that of his party in the state. It was felt that the attempt would be made to bring McDuffie's theory of the three confederacies into operation if supporters could be found in the south and west, in view of the threats of a dissolution of the union which accompanied many of the resolutions passed at the annexation meetings in South Carolina. If this had been done to intimidate the senate into the approval of the treaty, it had failed, and the whigs rejoiced, for they felt that South Carolina was too much in the habit lately of discussing all measures of national policy, in advance of the legislative action, with excited feelings and threats of a dissolution of the union if its wishes were not complied with. It could not be expected that the other members of the "Confederacy" would bear this dictation calmly; such action had had a tendency to lower South Carolina in the eyes of its sister states. It was exceedingly mortifying to the whigs to read the ridicule hurled at the people of South Carolina from all quarters of the country because of their gasconading.[24]

About this time R. B. Rhett added further fame or notoriety to his name by coming forth as the leader of the most radical faction in the state. A few years before, J. H. Hammond had feared that this same Rhett, together with some others whom Hammond called "the Regency" or "the Clique," were about to surrender the old state rights party with all its nullification doctrines, to conciliate the old union party and gain control of the state. Now, however, Rhett came forth in a way which out-Calhouned Calhoun, for the latter openly repudiated the movement at this time.

Early in the summer Rhett issued an address to his constituents (of Orangeburg, Barnwell, Beaufort, Colleton, St. John's Colleton) in which he declared himself in favor of a southern convention to devise ways and means for the annexation of Texas. Such a convention, however, he believed would be un-

[24] *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* June 26, 1844; *Charleston Courier,* May 30, 1844.

attainable until the presidential election was over. As to the tariff, he wanted the state to prepare by legislation to put herself once more "on her sovereignty" by calling a state convention to meet in April next, to apply nullification—"the rightful remedy"—if the new president and cabinet were not of a character to render state action unnecessary. In June and July there was much talk of a southern convention to devise ways and means against the tariff and abolition. Although the nomination of Polk and Dallas, carried by the friends of annexation, diverted some of the advocates of a southern convention, still the spark had been kindled and smoke began to rise in various places. Several meetings passed resolutions with a disunion flavor, and urged a southern convention. Then some of the more bold and less patient, among whom was I. E. Holmes, representative from Charleston district, stated that they were unequivocally for resistance—combined southern resistance, if it could be procured, but, if not, then state resistance. Some, still more bold and more hopeless of relief from congress and believing that the immediate assemblage of a southern convention, apparently the only thing that could save Texas for the United States or cause tariff reform, was as highly improbable as the "advent of our Saviour," were for separate state action. There came complaints that the old leaders of the state were failing when the final decisive steps were needed.[25]

Then, on the last day of July, came the Bluffton dinner for Rhett in St. Luke's parish, when this disunion and separate state action propaganda crystallized somewhat, and the so-called "Bluffton movement" was recognized by all. Here Rhett declared that there was no hope either in the election of Polk or a southern convention. Either secession or nullification was the only effective remedy. He recommended a state convention to meet after the next congress—which he expected to disappoint the south as usual—and to adopt one of these alternatives. The toasts at this dinner were quite generally very strong for resistance. The *Charleston Mercury* immediately espoused the

[25] *Charleston Courier*, June 27, Juy 27, 1844; *Charleston Mercury*, July 26, August 1, 1844; "Cato" in the *Mercury* in July; *Pendleton Messenger*, July 12, 1844; J. Hamilton to Calhoun, June 14, *Calhoun correspondence*; J. Hamilton to Hammond, July 10, Hammond manuscripts, in the Library of congress; *Niles' Weekly Register*, July 13, 27, August 3, 1844.

Bluffton movement, and "Brutus" ran a series of articles to show that the official declarations of the leaders of the state since 1841 had pledged South Carolina again and again to the most determined resistance of the enforcement of the present tariff system of 1842.[26]

At this time action was urged by the *Charleston Mercury* and the "Bluffton boys" against the "two enormous villainies," the tariff and abolitionism; the former, it was said, was already crushing the south, and if not promptly arrested would be the sure precursor of its utter and deadly ruin by the latter. They were declared "cohesive, co-operative, concurrent, kindred and coessential atrocities;" for it was but the next step in aggression and no degree further in crime, after having plundered southerners of the profits of their property, to wrest from them the property itself.[27]

[26] *Ibid.*, August 10, 17, 1844; *Charleston Mercury*, August 2, 8, 9, 1844.

[27] The political knaves, who oppressed them with unjust taxes, knew full well that the policy which weakened them against the assault of the abolitionist weakened them alike against the tariff iniquity; and the abolitionist knew as well that when the bulwark of the constitution was broken through to rob them of the fruits of their industry, if the invader were not driven back, but was suffered to secure a lodgment within the walls, abolitionism could march in through the breach to subvert their state institutions. As to the prospects, and when and how Carolina was to act to break the dishonoring chains which bound her, a series of questions was proposed. Was she to wait for the northern and other tariff democrats to cease playing the hypocrite at Baltimore and the traitor at Washington? No. There was no hope of congressional relief, as the democratic party had shown time and again. Was she to hope for relief and redress from the result of the presidential election? No. The president was helpless, as had been proven time and again. Was she to wait for a southern convention? No. She would then wait passive forever. Was she to try to bring the oppressors to terms by taxing northern manufactures? No. That was not practicable, and even if practicable it would be remedying oppressive taxation by increasing the burden of taxation. Therefore *resistance by separate state action* was the only remedy left. They were not sticklers for nullification, neither the word nor the precise mode as formerly tried, but would welcome any expedient to effect the same result. In fact they favored a modification of it which would not be offensive to the old opponents. At any rate, South Carolina was pledged, the time to act had come. *Charleston Mercury*, August 9, 1844; *Niles' Weekly Register*, August 17, 1844.

I. E. Holmes printed a strong communication in the *Charleston Mercury*, July 26, 1844, urging resistance — combined southern resistance. On July 10, J. Hamilton wrote to Hammond (Hammond manuscripts) that a southern convention was all that could save Texas for the United States, "but for which [convention] we might as well call as for the advent of our Saviour. Nothing alarms and disgusts me so much as the utter prostration of the spirit of the South. We are fit for nothing else but to

Rhett acknowledged, at the Bluffton dinner, that he "stood alone" among the congressional delegation of the state as to the course he urged, and the opposition now referred to him as the "lone star of disunion." Although Rhett professed still to be a good friend personally of Calhoun, and said that he would continue to work for Polk and Dallas, although expecting no good to come from their election, he was accused of being virtually at open war with Calhoun and the democratic party, prompted by madness and personal ambition to wrest the leadership of the state from Calhoun. His speech and the toasts at the dinner were cited as proof of this assertion. At any rate, the disunionists had hinted strongly that Calhoun had "flagged," and that henceforth their course would be different from his; because of his faltering, Calhoun was to be "whistled down" and the more impetuous and daring Rhett was to be followed. Other meetings and dinners followed, principally in Rhett's congressional district, and he did have some followers in the state who were not in favor of "hoping against hope" and had no faith in anything other than state action, which part of them were willing to postpone to May, 1845. Anti-tariff associations were formed which expressed in their constitutions a willingness to see every milder measure fairly tested before having recourse to independent state action, but admitted that they despaired of the efficacy of any but this separate state action.[28]

be overseers of the emancipation of our own slaves whenever our Masters will have decreed it."

[28] Hammond to his brother, August 25, 1844, Hammond manuscripts; *Charleston Mercury,* August 12, 18, 29, 31, September 14, 1844; *Charleston Courier,* August 14, 18, 1844; *Niles' Weekly Register,* August 17, September 7, 14, 21, October 12, 19, 1844. The whigs, of course, through their editor, Richard Yeadon of the *Charleston Courier,* raised their banner against nullification and disunion, when the issue first appeared in scattered utterings, and even came out in defense of the tariff, the evil effects of which they claimed were much exaggerated. The Clay club of Charleston repudiated the disunion doctrine and declared that if there was any one principle to which the members of the club were more attached than another, it was the perpetuity of the American union. They pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to defend it. They were against a southern convention "to extort new guarantees from the states" as a measure fraught with evil and only revolutionary in its tendency. But the whigs were not even as numerous in South Carolina now as they had been in 1840, for then there had been some men who felt that no state rights principle must necessarily be surrendered by acting with the whigs against Van Buren. Now, however, with the new candidates in the field, many such fell back into the democratic ranks,

Before the Bluffton dinner, Calhoun's Washington organ, the *Spectator,* denied the accusations made in the north that Calhoun was at the bottom of a plot to stir up disunion sentiment in South Carolina over the Texas and the tariff issues. This seemed to some of the old union men to be a return by Calhoun to his first love, a recovering of his nationality of feeling, and they said that they would gladly welcome him as a leader against the hotspurs of South Carolina, whose talk about disunion if Texas were not admitted was as foolish as that in Massachusetts about disunion if Texas were admitted. By the end of July the *Charleston Courier,* Senator Huger, and others were claiming Calhoun as a union champion but the action party, led by the *Charleston Mercury,* denied this championship.[29]

After the Bluffton movement had been launched, the democrats of Charleston held a meeting on August 19 as a sort of antidote to that movement. Those present adopted resolutions which pledged support to Polk and Dallas; they deprecated any division in the state; they were not ready for sovereign state action, because many still had hope of redress; they declared the election of Polk was important and should not be endangered; at any rate, southern unity of action should be procured, if possible, because of common interests; if relief failed from these sources, then, they admitted, the people of South Carolina must act; they appealed to the radical democrats to give up their advanced position and keep the state united; South Carolina, they said, was unjustly accused of a desire for disunion; they assured Calhoun that their faith in him was still strong.[30]

Soon after its inception the Bluffton movement had caused alarm in Charleston, for it produced in the old union men a disposition to renew the old issues, force the conservative state rights men from their principles and drive them either into a recantation or a minority position; the union men thought that

and left the few "regular full-blooded" whigs, such as General J. H. Adams, alone for Clay. *Charleston Courier,* June 27, July 10, 15, 20, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* June 21, August 16, 1844; *Charleston Mercury,* July 29, 1844.

[29] *Ibid.,* July 20, 25, 1844; *Charleston Courier,* June 24, 26, July 18, 1844.

[30] *Charleston Mercury,* August 21, 1844; *Niles' Weekly Register,* August 31, 1844.

by joining issue with the *Charleston Mercury* and Rhett they could cut off the radicals and so weaken the rest of the state rights party that if, at any time hereafter, they proposed to put the state on her sovereignty, they would be powerless to move. In order to prevent such a stroke by the old union leaders, the more moderate state rights men had held the Charleston meeting, and passed the above resolutions to prevent disunion among the party in the state, and to stop the embarrassment the South Carolina movement for state action caused the state rights leaders in Virginia and Georgia. Gradually, under this lead, public sentiment settled down against Rhett's course, and by the first of October all was again quiet for a brief period. Calhoun admitted, however, that the feeling of the state was deep, both on the tariff and abolitionism, and if Clay should be elected, or Polk should not fulfill expectations in case he were elected, the feeling would burst forth into action.[31]

The great majority of the state rights men and papers now professed thorough confidence that the results of Polk's election would be all that they could desire. F. W. Pickens in September made a journey to Tennessee and spent two days with Polk, which enabled him to give assurance to the state rights party in South Carolina that all was satisfactory in that direction. Polk, he assured them, had no connection with the New York managers, was entirely untrammeled, and was determined, if elected, to do all that he could to reform the government, to reduce the tariff of 1842 to a revenue measure entirely, to introduce strict economy, and to acquire Texas at all hazards. The situation was different from that of 1832, when the state rights men had no hearing with the democratic republican party, because Jackson had led them off, and none with the national republican party, because opposed on principles; now the southern issues were being forced upon the whole democratic party and they were apparently just about to adopt the state rights views. The state rights prospects were really better than they had been for years. All that was wanted was prudence and judgment to secure the fruits of a complete victory. Hence it was that the majority of the state rights party were deeply disgusted with the Beaufort and Colleton excitement, which the

[31] F. H. Elmore to Calhoun, August 26; Calhoun to Clemson, October 7, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

Charleston Mercury tried to keep up, and made every possible effort to counteract its effect.[32]

While Rhett and his "Bluffton boys" were pushing for immediate single state action, and the majority of the state rights party were opposing this and any talk of resistance whatever, placing implicit confidence in the national democratic party, some prominent men of the state continued to talk of a southern convention, with the idea of an ultimate southern confederacy. Judge Langdon Cheves was perhaps the most prominent of these. He was decidedly against the calling of a state convention, and was not for resistance by the action of South Carolina alone. He was against any rash or sudden act; he was just as decidedly against a blind devotion to the union in spite of any sufferings. He would not bear the insufferable and insulting oppression of the tariff one moment longer when it could be judiciously resisted. This point of judicious resistance meant to him that time when the southern states could be united so firmly as to constitute a permanent southern confederacy. A number of men had entertained this idea for years. Cheves now would have the south set about a deliberate, slow but sure course of preparation towards that end. While the majority of the state rights party welcomed the part of his program that cautioned against rash action, they paid little attention to his plans for the distant future. They felt that the election would make unnecessary such plans.[33]

The old union men now disagreed among themselves as to future prospects. Some felt that the union was doomed over the slavery issue, and that the tariff was simply a minor question, or a lure to divert the mind from the main object. Abolition or disunion would be presented as the only alternatives, and of course the latter would be preferred. Therefore, they approved of Judge Cheves' program to prepare the south for a strong and permanent confederacy.[34] The whigs and some of

[32] *Pendleton Messenger,* September 13, 1844; *Greenville Republican,* September 6, 20, 1844; Pickens to Calhoun, September 9; Calhoun to Wharton, September 17; Calhoun to G. W. Hank, October 14, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[33] Letter by Langdon Cheves, published in the *Charleston Mercury,* September 11, 1844, and issued as a pamphlet, in B. F. Perry pamphlet collection. *Charleston Mercury,* September 11, 13, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* September 27, 1844.

[34] Thomas Bennett to Poinsett, October 4, 1844, Poinsett manuscripts, in Pennsylvania historical society library.

the old ultra union men denounced Cheves' proposition strongly; they were against any idea of ultimate disunion, however remote, and continually cited as their text the part of Washington's farewell address which advised an indignant frown on the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of the country from the rest.[35]

Poinsett, who was the leader of the unionist armed opposition to nullification in South Carolina in 1832-1833, had no sympathy with the idea of a southern confederacy and rejoiced at obstacles which he declared made it utterly impracticable. In the first place, slave labor was proving so unprofitable in the Atlantic coast states that its northern confine was now Maryland, and it was destined to recede from that state, Virginia, and North Carolina, where it was becoming daily less profitable and less necessary. In the upper districts of the slave states it was even now more profitable to hire labor at seed time and harvest than to maintain it the year round, and the slaves were sent to the cotton-growing regions. The result was that the great mass of the white population of the north Atlantic slave states would have few vital interests in common with the slave owners, and would not be ready to make the sacrifices which a separation from the free states and the maintenance of an independent government would involve. South Carolina would therefore be the northern frontier state of a southern confederacy, due to this natural death of slavery in Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. In the southwest, Louisiana would not and could not sever its advantageous connections with New York, Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. The confederacy would be limited to South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, a group in which South Carolina and its citizens would have but small influence. How could such a confederacy resist all of Europe and the rest of America hostilely arrayed against it? These countries would pass discriminating duties against the produce of slave labor, and later even violently interfere. A confederacy on a slave labor basis could not support a merchant marine, and hence not a fighting marine. Armies would have to be supported to repel this foreign interference. Such great and overwhelming haz-

[35] *Charleston Courier,* September 12, October 29, 1844; *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* October 9, November 20, 1844.

ards were surely not to be incurred either because of the tariff or the abolitionists, for the tariff would be put down by the greatest majority ever united in America, and as for the "puny efforts of the abolitionists," "a man might as well dash his brains out against a wall because he is tormented by a gnat on his forehead." The democratic party, for the sake of the union, would see that the constitutional guarantees as to slavery were maintained. The union was not to be endangered by southerners, because it was the ark of their safety, the only bulwark of their institutions and liberties, and the only security they had for the preservation of their property.[36]

Others, of the state rights party, proposed a program which was a sort of compromise between the proposals of Rhett and Cheves. George McDuffie and James Hamilton were of this class. They would have South Carolina announce that she was determined no longer to submit to the tariff of 1842, or to have her domestic institutions subject to menace and vituperation on the floor of congress. The southern states were to be earnestly and affectionately invited to meet in convention the next May, in case the southern wrongs then continued unrighted. In case the southern states declined, then South Carolina on July 4 was to have a state convention and the question of submission or resistance was to be definitely settled.[37]

When it was learned that Polk was elected, all became rather quiet. Texas was won and the south was put temporarily at rest on the slavery question. The democratic party bade fair to do justice on the tariff and the general governmental reforms for which the state rights party stood. Accordingly such men as General Hamilton, who had talked of the possibilities of state

[36] Poinsett to Thomas Bennett, October 14, 1844, Poinsett manuscripts. About a month before the election, James S. Rhett made a speech, which was later published, in which he said he had obtained a commission from the union party central committee to go to Washington as a commissioner for certain purposes, one of which was to certify to General Jackson that the union party would be found in arms against him should he invade the state, and they would never bear arms against their fellow citizens of South Carolina. Two prominent members of the party, in correspondence, denied the authority of this statement. Poinsett said that he believed the union party was "united in a firm determination to resist nullification to the uttermost." Thomas Bennett to Poinsett, October 4; Poinsett to Bennett, October 14, 1844, Poinsett manuscripts.

[37] General J. Hamilton to Hammond, October 4, 1844, Hammond manuscripts; *Charleston Mercury*, September 27, 1844.

action, now urged that South Carolina say nothing that would alienate the rest of the south or any part of the democratic party. Trust in the party was now the watchword.[38]

The elections to congress and the state legislature in October, 1844, created very little excitement. The whigs made efforts in Charleston and Pendleton, but in both districts they were signally defeated by a majority of thirty and twenty per cent, respectively, of the total vote cast. The only whig candidate for congress, in Pendleton-Greenville-Laurens, was defeated by a large majority, and the returns of the elections to the state legislature showed not a single bona fide whig in that body. It was pointed out as unprecedented that, at a time when the country was divided into two great political parties, the legislature of any state should be unanimously in favor of either.[39]

Following the election, the members of the Clay club of Charleston issued a circular addressed: "To all who revere the Union; who hold fast to the Constitution; who desire peace rather than a civil war," stating their opinion of the issues involved in the recent election. They registered objection because, they said, the opposition had urged the popular mind to secession by every argument and appeal: sectional prejudice, state pride, personal gallantry, private interest. The whigs, not as whigs but as citizens, declared themselves against such conspiracies, and as citizens had asked the democratic candidates to state their positions on the questions of state resistance and of giving the election of presidential electors to the people.[40] The democratic candidates had refused to answer the whigs, on the grounds that they were responsible to their party only. The

[38] Hamilton to Hammond, November, 1844, Hammond manuscripts; *Charleston Mercury,* November 13, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* November 22, 1844.

[39] As to the popular vote of the state, had the people voted for electors as in other states it was estimated that the whigs would have polled about 3,000 to the democrats' 56,000. At any rate, no calculation could give Clay more than 6,000. The truth was probably about 5,000. *Ibid.*, July 5, 26, October 10, 11, 18, 25, November 1, 1844; *Greenville Republican,* October 4, 1844; *Charleston Mercury,* October 8, 12, 17, 29, 1844; *Charleston Courier,* October 14, 1844; Bennett to Poinsett, October 4, 1844, Poinsett manuscripts; Pickens to Calhoun, November 6, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

[40] See Chauncey S. Boucher, "Sectionalism, representation, and the electoral question in ante bellum South Carolina," in *Washington university studies,* 4: part 2: no. 1.

whigs said that this was equivalent to saying that the whigs, by becoming such, had ceased to have the rights of citizens. Then it was that this class of citizens, so deeply wronged, had determined to organize and support an opposition. The democrats had confused disunion with the "Polk and Dallas, free trade and democracy issue," had put up such avowed disunionists as John A. Stuart, editor of the *Charleston Mercury,* and had held the party so well in hand that they might safely claim the victory as a disunion victory. This address was intended as a warning to the people that this disunion crowd was masquerading as the democratic party. The *Charleston Mercury,* in answer, pronounced the address a base and slanderous assault, secretly gotten up, to be used in other states as campaign material.[41]

The tariff and abolitionism were now continually linked together as abuses which the south was determined to correct. Sometimes one would be particularly assailed, and then the other, but more often they were spoken of jointly and in the same breath. By this time, however, there were some who held that the slavery issue was the all-important one, and they accounted for the lack of excitement at the fall elections on the grounds that the people, feeling confident that abolitionism could find no advocates in the South Carolina legislature, cared but little for the tariff and other grounds of complaint against congress.[42] Although the people were right in believing that the abolitionists could find no defenders in the state legislature, there were the same differences of opinion as to the position the state should assume which had appeared during the summer.

Perhaps the most decisive stand the legislature took on the slavery question concerned the treatment of Samuel Hoar, an abolitionist agent from Massachusetts.[43] Governor Hammond's

[41] *Charleston Mercury,* October 29, 1844; *Niles' Weekly Register,* November 16, 1844.

[42] Bennett to Poinsett, October 4, 1844, Poinsett manuscripts.

[43] Samuel Hoar came to South Carolina as an agent appointed by the governor of Massachusetts to reside in Charleston, in pursuance of a series of resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts legislature, in order to test the constitutionality of laws of South Carolina passed in 1822 and 1835, which prescribed that all free persons of color attached to vessels coming into the ports of the state should be imprisoned during the time the vessels remained in port. Hoar was to try to protect the colored citizens of Massachusetts. Upon arrival in Charleston he announced to Governor Hammond the object of his mission. The governor promptly laid his communica-

message pictured clearly the wrongs of the south, from the standpoint of an old nullifier, but left it to the legislators to

tion before the legislature, and it was referred to the committee on federal relations; a report and resolutions were submitted. The preamble declared that it had been upon principles of public policy affecting its safety and vital interests that South Carolina had passed the act of 1835 against the introduction of free negroes and persons of color into the state. Massachusetts had sent an agent to defeat a police regulation essential to the peace of South Carolina; this agent came to subvert South Carolina's domestic institutions and its internal police. South Carolina had not surrendered its right of internal government and police in joining the union and it did not regard as citizens, within the meaning of the constitution, the persons Massachusetts tried to force on it as such by this mission. It was a deliberate scheme to subvert the domestic institutions of the southern states in violation of the terms of the national compact and the good faith of the parties thereto. Therefore they resolved that the right to exclude from their territories seditious persons, or others whose presence might be dangerous to their peace, was essential to every independent state. Free negroes and persons of color were not citizens of the United States within the meaning of the constitution, which conferred upon the citizens of one state the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states. The governor was therefore requested to expel Mr. Hoar from South Carolina, after due notice to depart, and the executive was to be sustained by the legislature in any measures he might adopt to that end.

The house acted at once upon the subject, with but one vote against the report and resolutions; this vote came from Memminger, who opposed them only on the ground of the doubtful constitutionality of the procedure and preferred that the case be made in the courts. He felt that the supreme court would uphold the South Carolina law. The resolutions were immediately sent to the senate, and that body passed them with the same unanimity; here Colonel Perry of Greenville alone objected, on the same grounds as Memminger. The discussion in both houses was brief and excited. The conduct of the Massachusetts legislature in continually warring against southern institutions, and the protection afforded southern runaway slaves by her citizens, had already provoked the South Carolina people to such a degree that this new insult was all that was needed to cause intense excitement. *Columbia Southern Chronicle*, December 11, 1844.

On the next day, December 6, the governor dispatched the attorney-general and Colonel Preston S. Brooks, an aide-de-camp, to Charleston to escort Hoar to the steamboat. The governor's private instructions to his agents expressed some anxiety as to the affair. (Hammond to Henry Bailey, attorney-general, December 5, 1844, Hammond manuscripts.) The first object, he said, was to carry into effect the resolutions of the legislature. That must be done fully, promptly, and certainly, be the consequences what they might. At the same time it was "of the greatest importance that without incurring any delay or hazarding the consummation intended, all should be conducted decently and with such a tone of quiet and air of dignity" as would "shew the world" that South Carolina was "acting more from principle than impulse"; that it was the state of South Carolina which spoke and acted as such a state should and always might be expected to speak and act; and that these resolutions were "not merely an outburst of excited men. There must be no *mobbism* about it."

Hoar, at the suggestion of some of the citizens, took his departure before the use of force was necessary. It was anticipated that this would bring South Carolina to

adopt such measures as they thought best. Although the majority of the state, looking to the democratic party, had now adopted the wait-awhile policy, the few "Bluffton boys," Rhett followers, who were in the legislature, were bound to make trouble. The governor himself, though in 1840 bitterly opposed to Rhett, was still so thorough a nullifier that anything which looked towards state action pleased him. His message, accordingly, had a strong leaning towards the Bluffton movement, and Pickens in the senate and Memminger in the house led the attack upon it. They said that since South Carolina had taken a prominent part in electing Polk, the democratic nominee, and had approved his announced principles and those of the party, it was bad policy for the governor, in a public state paper, to express an utter want of confidence in the great democratic party and its president. They said, further, that the people and the majority of the legislature had faith in the party, and opposed anything like state action now because of the tariff, Texas, and the abolitionists. It was ably argued that the state, in her sovereign capacity, should show no precipitousness, but should unite in her counsels and await the outcome of what seemed to be favorable indications.[44]

In the senate, resolutions were unanimously approved November 29, expressing confidence in the administration both as to Texas and the tariff. An additional resolution expressly declared that if disappointed in its expectations, South Carolina would maintain that, by awaiting events for a time, it had not in the slightest degree waived its reserved right, in its sovereign capacity, to protect its citizens in any future emergency.[45]

a direct issue with Massachusetts, an event which was indeed welcomed, for the South Carolina people desired to know whether they were "to live freemen," or "to succumb to their own slaves, and their false and fanatical northern friends." *Charleston Mercury,* December 16, 1844; *Pendleton Messenger,* December 20, 1844. Even the papers which at first regretted the action as rather rash, came to approve it heartily as the most proper and only effective way of handling the case. *Columbia Southern Chronicle,* December 11, 1844. During the next year Massachusetts decided to turn the matter over to the United States government and demanded (declaring that she would continue to demand until satisfied) that the general government so change the jurisdiction of the federal courts as to enable any citizen of Massachusetts, who might hereafter be imprisoned in any other state solely on account of his color, to urge his claim to liberty and protection in the courts of the United States. *Charleston Mercury,* March 26, 1845.

[44] *Pendleton Messenger,* December 6; *Charleston Courier,* November 28, 29, 30, 1844.

[45] *Ibid.,* December 20, 1844; *South Carolina senate journals,* 1844, p. 26.

In the house the committee of the whole took up the question and the debate continued for several days; one side contended for resolutions similar to those of the senate, and the other defended the stand of Governor Hammond and the "Bluffton boys." The case of Hoar interrupted the debate on the main question, but was soon disposed of by the resolutions for his expulsion. Finally, December 18, the house voted, 57 to 39, to adopt the senate resolutions. A plot of the vote shows a rather clear case of sectionalism: the great majority of the parish votes of the coastland were against the resolutions expressing confidence in the administration, while a majority of the district votes of the uplands registered approval.[46]

In the meantime congress had not started out in a way to conciliate the south, for almost the first important action was the repeal of the twenty-first rule.[47] This, it was felt, meant the legitimizing and nationalizing of abolitionism, the virtual assumption by congress of power over the existence of slavery, and a direct invitation to the abolitionists to go on with further demands. This put an end to the patience of some of the men who had before this been the strongest against any talk of disunion. Even the Columbia whig organ, which up to this time had daily printed the part of Washington's farewell address against disunion tendencies, now discontinued it and each day asked the southern members in congress to indicate when the time for action had come. Since the Van Buren-Benton democrats showed a strong disposition to join the whigs against the annexation of Texas, that question, which it had been believed was settled, seemed again doubtful.[48]

To Calhoun, the vote on the rescinding of the twenty-first rule together with other indications showed that the two sections, north and south, were daily approaching deadly conflict, and that no longer could the south look to her northern democratic allies for support on the slavery issue. And yet the majority of the house of the South Carolina legislature, acting in accordance with what they believed to be the views and desires of Calhoun, still thought it best to do nothing to show distrust of the northern

[46] *Charleston Courier*, December 2, 4, 5, 7, 20, 1844.

[47] Referred to frequently as the twenty-fifth rule, in correspondence and the press.

[48] *Columbia Southern Chronicle*, December 25, 1844; *Charleston Mercury*, December 18, 1844; Calhoun to Clemson, December 27, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

democrats, whether they felt it or not. In the senate a set of resolutions was passed, December 16, to the effect that the recent repeal of the twenty-first rule and the receipt of abolition petitions by congress constituted a flagrant outrage against the southern states and a step towards a dissolution of the union; on this subject South Carolina admitted no legislative power in congress, and such legislation would be in fact a dissolution of the federal compact; and, in case of any such legislation the governor was requested to call the legislature to decide on the mode and manner of defense of southern rights and liberties. These resolutions, together with several more to the same effect offered by members of the house, were postponed indefinitely in the house on December 18 by a vote of 55 to 38. Again the parishes of the coastal section voted almost solidly against the defeat of these resolutions, while the upland districts were preponderately against the resolutions.[49]

The debate in the house showed much indecision, doubt, and division. The position held by the house when it adjourned was that of the wait-awhile party. By the adoption of the first set of resolutions from the senate, expressing confidence in the administration, they administered a rebuke to the action party, and by the vote to postpone all others, thus taking no action on the rescinding of the twenty-first rule, they displayed a continued confidence in the national democratic party, in spite of its recent mistake. The leaders of the opposition to the Bluffton movement, who were acting in accord with Calhoun's instructions, advised him that he need have no fears of a serious division in the state. The strength of those in the state legislature who were opposed to the position the state had assumed was said to be but twenty-one men; and, even in Beaufort and Colleton, the supposed hotbed of Rhett followers, it was said that combining the senators and representatives there was a majority of six against the course pursued by Rhett.[50]

Governor Hammond and the "Bluffton boys" were intensely disgusted with the work of the legislature, and laid it all at the

[49] Calhoun to Hunter, December 29, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence; South Carolina senate journals,* 1844, p. 95; *South Carolina house journals,* 1844, p. 163; *Charleston Courier,* December 20, 1844.

[50] An analysis of the votes shows that this was an exaggerated statement. *Ibid.,* December 21, 1844; Pickens to Calhoun, December 28, 1844, *Calhoun correspondence.*

door of Calhoun. They accused him of having interfered to prevent the sending of a letter from the South Carolina delegation in congress to the state legislature to show that though they had been "silent witnesses of the immolation of the twenty-first rule at the shrine of Molach, they were not indifferent spectators of the sacrifice, etc." Such a letter, it was felt, might have encouraged the house to pass the resolutions against the course the abolitionist issue was allowed to take in congress. The result of the legislative session was that the part of the governor's message which embodied the views of the action party was repudiated, and confidence in the democratic party both before and after the repeal of the twenty-first rule was triumphantly voted, and any expression of indignation at the repeal of that rule decisively checked. The Rhett men now feared that such a "glorious thing" as was Hammond's message would never again be witnessed, for he would be the last governor of the state who would speak for it as of old. "The Roman spirit" was going out with him, to be followed by "a dynasty of the patent Democratic brand." Such was the deplorable position of South Carolina, according to the action party, and for all this Calhoun was held responsible. "Policy — don't prevent Mr. Calhoun from getting control of the Administration [illegible] Polk and securing the succession — above all don't separate from Mr. Calhoun, we can do nothing without him — these were the shameful watchwords of the 'chivalry of South Carolina'," to which watchwords the action men attributed the attitude of the state legislature.[51]

[51] McDuffie to Hammond, December 12, 1844; Hammond to McDuffie, December 27, 1844; James M. Walker to Hammond, January 17, 1845, Hammond manuscripts. In the letter to McDuffie, Governor Hammond said: "I wish Mr. Calhoun well in every respect. I would prefer him to any aspirant for the presidency and would do all I could do to elevate him to it. I believe at bottom he is sound and will in a short time be right again. But at this critical period his unaccountable desertion — it is nothing less — has crushed South Carolina and destroyed her cause forever, I fear. If history deigns to notice this era what can it fail to say of him but that at the all important juncture for action he gave way, withdrew our state from her commanding position, threw himself upon the support of allies *known* to be treacherous, retreated before the enemy and dreaded the fate of the war. It will also be sure to attribute a motive, and that motive will be fatal to him as a patriot and statesman — personal ambition for mere office — and for one for which everybody saw he had so little chance that the thing was even more ridiculous, if possible, than wicked. . . . Did I not know that you see and lament it all as I do I would not vent my own feelings in this way. God send him a safe deliverance, though I see no way for it."

Upon coming into office, Governor Aiken, the first of the "dynasty of the patent Democratic brand," issued a proclamation for a day of thanksgiving, which was quite generally interpreted, in spite of Aiken's denial of its intention that way, as a direct slap at his immediate predecessor, Hammond; the people were to express thanks that Hammond's course had been defeated.[52]

Chauncey S. Boucher

Washington University
Saint Louis, Missouri

[52] A Columbia editor, a sympathizer of Hammond's, wrote the ex-governor that he considered the proclamation the "very littlest of all the little things of the day, and might have excited a smile of triumph as well as contempt, if it had not emanated from a Governor of South Carolina!" He declared that it had met a just reward, for he had heard no man speak of it "but with indignation, or derision or contempt." A. H. Pemberton to Hammond, February 6; Governor Aiken to Hammond, January 24; J. M. Walker to Hammond, January 17, 1845, Hammond manuscripts.

THE SOUTH AND THE ARMING OF THE SLAVES

In the last year of the civil war one of the most important questions forced on the confederate authorities for attention was that of reënforcing its armies in the field, particularly those of Lee and Johnston. The government was at its wits' end, and some definite and workable plan of recruiting had to be formed if its armies were successfully to oppose the victorious and steadily increasing forces of the federal government of the north. Sherman was advancing northwards from Savannah through the Carolinas to join forces with Grant, who was slowly but surely pushing Lee's weakened army before him. A variety of schemes was considered and tried. The conscript law was extended and the exemption privileges restricted. Free negroes and slaves were increasingly impressed for non-military duties, thus releasing white soldiers for duty in the ranks of the armies. Even a dictatorship on the Roman model was proposed and only the objections of Lee, the proposed dictator, prevented its consummation. Gradually, however, all efforts came to be focused on the absorbing question: shall we arm the slaves? Not unnaturally many opposed such a radical step, preferring rather to sacrifice the best white blood to keep the slaves in bondage than to utilize the latent capacity inherent in the negroes for the making of soldiers.

The north early made use of negroes as soldiers for service in its armies. The south, because of political, social, and psychological considerations, only at the end of the war and as a last resort turned to this practically untouched source of military strength to fill its rapidly-thinning ranks. This subject has already been very ably discussed by Mr. N. W. Stephenson,[1]

[1] N. W. Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review*, 18: 295 ff. For accounts of the use of negroes as soldiers by the federal government see John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: a history* (New York, 1890), 6: 440 ff.; Horace Greeley, *The American conflict: a history of the great rebellion in the United States of America, 1860-'64; its causes, incidents and results: intended to exhibit especially its moral and political phases, with the drift and progress of American opinion respecting human slavery from 1776 to the close of the war for*

93417

but detailed treatment is given only to the final and successful effort to adopt this policy. In the present paper it is proposed

the union (Hartford, 1864-1866), 2: 515 ff.; James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850 to the final restoration of home rule at the south in 1877* (New York, 1904), 4:333 ff.; Military historical society of Massachusetts, *Proceedings* (Boston, 1913), 13: 289 ff.; Thomas W. Higginson, *History of the black regiments* (Boston, 1890); George W. Williams, *History of negro troops in the war of the rebellion* (New York, 1888).

That President Lincoln was at first very reluctant to interfere with slavery in any way or with the status of the slaves and that his expressed intent in using force was to compel the speedy return of the "erring sisters" to the federal union is a matter of common knowledge. On April 29, 1861, Simon Cameron, the secretary of war, presumably with Lincoln's approval advised one Dodson, a negro, who had tendered the services of colored men to serve as soldiers, that "this Department has no intention, at present, to call into service . . . any colored soldiers." And on August 6, 1862, in reply to a letter of August 5, the secretary of war advised the governor of Wisconsin that "the President declines to receive . . . negroes as troops." *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), third series, 1: 107, 133; 2: 297, 314. As time passed, however, Lincoln came to regard the abolition of slavery as one of the logical and necessary fulfillments of northern success. After the issuing of the emancipation proclamation the use of negroes, slave or free, as soldiers and their inclusion in the draft became the accepted policy of the federal government.

An interesting commentary on the use of negroes as soldiers is to be found in a letter dated as late as October 25, 1864, by General W. T. Sherman, written from his field headquarters at Gaylesville, Georgia, to Secretary Stanton, apparently in reply to a request from Stanton for an expression of opinion. Sherman wrote: "I do not wish to be considered as in any way adverse to the organization of negro regiments, further than as to its effects on the white race. . . . If negroes are to fight . . . they will not be content with sliding back into the status of slave and free negro. I much prefer to keep negroes yet for some time to come in a subordinate state, for our prejudices, yours as well as mine, are not yet schooled for absolute equality. . . . I would use negroes as surplus, but not spare a single white man, not one." *Ibid.*, first series, 39: part 3: 428. Sherman was opposed to the use of negroes as soldiers, because he felt that conscripted white men might, under the draft law, buy negro substitutes. This opposition was consistent and continuous. He preferred their use for noncombatant purposes, such as teamsters, laborers, cooks, and the like. *Ibid.*, first series, 39: part 3: 428; third series, 3: 548, 574; 4: 436, 559, 734; William T. Sherman, *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman* (New York, 1896), 2: 244. On June 26, 1864, he wrote: "My preference is to make this radical change [the use of negroes as soldiers] with natural slowness . . . the great mass of our soldiery must be of the white race and the black troops should, for some years, be used with caution and with due regard to the prejudices of the races." *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, third series, 4: 454. In December Secretary Stanton visited General Sherman at Savannah and one of the matters discussed related to the military use of negroes. Stanton favored such action. Sherman says: "We discussed the negro question very fully," and as a result order number 15, dated January 16, 1865, was issued providing in great detail for the enlistment of colored troops, giving them "certain pos-

not only to discuss this last effort, but also to consider the earlier attempts and in particular the first definite proposal, emanating from General Patrick Ronayne Cleburne, an Irishman, and an officer of the army occupying a responsible and conspicuous position. General Cleburne's proposition was made in January, 1864, and though at that time it was rejected without consideration, his plan, practically as outlined and with the full support of General R. E. Lee, was finally adopted only after it was too late. At the time of making his proposal, General Cleburne was in command of a division in General W. J. Hardee's corps of the confederate army of Tennessee and had acquired an enviable reputation as an efficient and capable officer and as a gallant and daring leader.

In the beginning of the war some of the more far-seeing and less prejudiced southerners conceived of and suggested the use of negroes in the confederate armies, but these citizens were, as a rule, not large owners of slaves and had little to lose by such employment and everything to gain. Generally speaking, the white soldiers wanted to do the fighting, preferring to leave the drudgery of trench-digging, cooking, and other tasks of a similar nature to the negro slaves. In the first months of the war, however, numerous offers of the services of negro men were made by their masters.[2]

Such service was definitely suggested as early as April 26, 1861, by C. M. Hubbard of James City county, Virginia, who wrote Governor John Letcher of that state suggesting the use of negroes in the "military service," particularly as laborers, and also "in any other way that the safety of the country might require."[3] On July 19, 1861, W. S. Turner of Helena, Arkansas, a fellow townsman of General Cleburne's, in a letter to L. P. Walker, secretary of war at Richmond, wrote for "myself and many others in this district" to ascertain if "we could get negro

sessory rights to land which afterwards became matters of judicial inquiry and decision." Sherman, *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman,* 2: 249 ff.; Edward Robins, *W. T. Sherman* (American crisis biographies — Philadelphia, [1905]), 262 ff.; "Diary and correspondence of Salmon P. Chase," in American historical association, *Annual report,* 1902 (Washington, 1903), 2: 347 ff.

[2] Walter L. Fleming, *Civil war and reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 205.

[3] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 51: part 2: 47.

regiments received for the confederate service, officered, of course, by white men." Perhaps Cleburne was one of the "many others." The war department replied August 2, 1861, stating that the government was "not prepared to accept the negro regiments tendered" as there "is a superabundance of our own color tendering their services."[4] On June 28, 1861, the general assembly of the state of Tennessee proposed an act (passed September 3, 1861) authorizing the governor "to receive into military service all free male persons of color between the ages of 15 and 50."[5] The Virginia legislature as early as February 4, 1862, was engaged in the consideration of a bill to enroll all the free negroes in the state for military service in the armed forces of the confederacy. The measure was considered favorably, but no action was taken.[6] In this connection it is also interesting to note that a regiment of free negroes (the "Native Guards") organized in April, 1861, was mustered into the service of the state of Louisiana and was used, on occasions, until on March 24, 1862, it was ordered to report to Major-General J. L. Lewis for use in the defenses of New Orleans.[7] These troops remained on duty in New Orleans, and upon the capture of the city by the federal forces under General B. F. Butler in May, 1862, they became a part of the spoils of war; on September 27, 1862, they were mustered into the federal service. Later four other negro regiments were organized in the Louisiana department.[8] In November, 1862, certain mulattoes of Mobile whose ancestors were made free by the treaties with France in 1802, were, at their own request, enlisted for the defense of Mobile by the authorization of the Alabama legislature and a year later, at the urgent request of General D. H. Maury, were re-

[4] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 1: 482, 529.

[5] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 1: 409; Greeley, *The American conflict*, 2: 521.

[6] *Ibid.*, 2: 522; *American annual cyclopaedia and register of important events* (New York, 1862-1875), 1864, p. 202.

[7] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 1: 1020; Greeley, *The American conflict*, 2: 522.

[8] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 15: 556, 559; *ibid.*, fourth series, 1: 625, 1020; Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, 6: 449 ff.; *Private and official correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, during the period of the civil war*, edited by Jesse A. Marshall ([Norwood, Mass.,] 1917), 2: 209, 270, 328, 400, 418; "Diary and correspondence of Salmon P. Chase," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1902, 2: 311 ff.

ceived into the confederate service as heavy artillery, though the secretary of war, James A. Seddon, did not favor the transfer.[9]

After the first suggestions failed the matter seems to have been dropped and does not appear to have come up again until August, 1863, when W. C. Micon of Florida proposed the drafting of slaves for military service. The matter was at the time considered premature and inadvisable and so was dropped.[10] About this time (July 25, 1863) some of the most prominent officers of the confederate army of Tennessee then in camp about Chattanooga, Cleburne among them, had earnestly petitioned the Richmond authorities to take prompt steps for the recruitment of the army by reduction of exemptions from the draft and by the return of the great number of extra-duty men to the ranks, but no proposal for enlisting and arming the slaves was then made.[11] On August 29, 1863, the Alabama legislature petitioned President Davis recommending the propriety of considering the employment of slaves as soldiers, but no action was taken. On November 11, 1863, the matter was again suggested but the idea was rejected.[12] That the confederate authorities were coming to recognize the military value of negroes as soldiers is indicated by the discussion of their use in the federal armies in the annual report for the year 1863 of the confederate secretary of war.[13]

On December 8, 1863, President Davis in his annual message to congress urged the employment of negroes as wagoners, cooks, nurses, and laborers on fortifications and government works. The suggestion was taken up by the house on December 11 and by the senate on December 30. The result was a bill which was passed by the house on February 1, 1864, after a month's consideration, promptly amended by the senate and then passed by both houses of congress and signed by the president on February 17, 1864. This bill, which was an act to "in-

[9] Fleming, *Civil war and reconstruction in Alabama*, 86; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 1: 1088; 2: 94, 197.

[10] Pierce Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin* (American crisis biographies — Philadelphia, 1906), 349.

[11] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 2: 671.

[12] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 2: 767, 947.

[13] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 2: 998.

crease the efficiency of the army by the employment of free negroes and slaves," provided for their use in accordance with the suggestions of President Davis.[14] This act was the first definite move in the direction of authorizing the use of negroes in a military way.

At the time Davis made his suggestion, the military situation of the confederacy was making it plain that some new sources of man-power must be discovered and utilized. After the disastrous operations in the fall of 1863, which culminated in the loss of Chattanooga, the western army of Tennessee had become so weakened in numbers that additions to its strength were necessary if the federal advance in the spring was to be successfully opposed. Desertions to join the cavalry and to avoid reënlisting,[15] straggling, and the constant detailing of able-bodied men in the ranks to miscellaneous non-military duties were playing havoc with the army. It was known that Grant and Sherman were gathering together a great army that should be able, by sheer weight of numbers, to fight its way south from Chattanooga, take Atlanta, and destroy the confederate army opposing it. Lee in Virginia had suffered heavy losses in his Pennsylvania campaign in the preceding summer and was exerting every effort to gather together sufficient men to enable him to keep the federal army out of Richmond. It therefore became a matter of paramount importance for the confederate authorities to consider how best to prepare to meet the impending spring drives in Virginia and northern Georgia.

In the western army, despite the appeals that were made for the reënlistment for the duration of the war of the three-year men whose terms were expiring, the response was slow and many men absented themselves to visit their homes.[16] Even as late as March 23, 1864, less than fifty per cent of Hardee's corps had reënlisted, and many other organizations were little if any better.[17] The greater part of General Cleburne's command was from Arkansas and Texas, and the Mississippi river, guarded

[14] *Journals of the confederate congress* (Washington, 1904), 3: 446, 496, 567, 655, 677, 741, 794; 5: 522; 6: 507, 567, 720 ff., 815; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, pp. 202, 209.

[15] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 32: part 2: 604.

[16] *Ibid.,* first series, 34: part 2: 630.

[17] *Ibid.,* first series, 34: part 3: 670.

by the federal forces, formed an impenetrable barrier to free communication. Many of the men were anxious for word from home and oft-repeated reports had come to them of cruelties practiced on the resident population. Every instinct of manhood called on them to return home. Cleburne, always a man of warm sympathies, felt profoundly the extent of the sacrifice these men were called upon to make, but he set high above all else the achievement of southern independence. Adapting himself to the peculiar conditions of a volunteer soldiery and laying aside, for the moment, his official status as commander, he appealed to his men as a man and a comrade to give up everything and stand by cause and country. So successful was he in inspiring his men with his own high purpose and exalted patriotism that his division reënlisted almost to a man.[18] Later the confederate congress passed an act retaining the three-year men in service, but those whose terms had expired and who had not reenlisted had become scattered and the moral effect of voluntary reënlistment was lost in those commands where the response had not been forthcoming.[19]

Cleburne, taking note of the deplorable state in which the western army found itself, set about to discover a way to fill up the rapidly-thinning ranks. To add to the slow response of the men in reënlisting, lax enforcement of the draft laws had created a situation that was not only unfair, but fraught with many dangers. To obtain the needed men, one untouched source of recruitment for military service seemed to recommend itself. Over one half million able-bodied negro slaves were doing duty as cooks, teamsters and the like, thus replacing white men who could be assigned to the army, but no negroes had been armed and trained as soldiers. General Cleburne, fully comprehending the disproportion in the military resources of the north and south, was among the first forcibly to point out the efficacy of employing negroes as soldiers.

President Davis, recognizing the fact that many confederate disasters and incomplete successes were in large measure due to the lack of sufficient military forces, had ordered (Decem-

[18] Ninety per cent of those present for duty came forward; of the whole command, present and absent, sixty per cent reënlisted. *Southern historical society papers*, 31: 158.

[19] *Ibid.; Journals of the confederate congress*, 3: 765 ff.

ber 8, 1863) that the armies be increased by bringing back all men improperly absent, by forbidding draft substitutes, by putting in the ranks all hospital and train details and able-bodied men doing duty as wagoners, cooks, nurses, and the like.[20] Cleburne, however, maintained that even if these available sources were drained to the utmost and if all exempts below eighteen and above forty-five, capable of bearing arms, were conscripted and called into the army, the relief would be only temporary and would "leave us twelve months hence in the same perdicament [*sic*] we are in now." Under the existing conditions he maintained that "through lack of system the fruits of our struggles have invariably slipped away from us and left us nothing but long lists of dead and mangled. . . . Our soldiers can see no end to this state of affairs except our own exhaustion . . . [and] as between loss of independence and the loss of slavery" he assumed "that every patriot would freely give up the latter." [21]

In the latter part of December, Cleburne's staff noted that he was for several days deeply preoccupied in writing. Finally, his work finished, he called his staff together and read them his manuscript, which was nothing less than an elaborate argument advocating the use of negroes as soldiers in the southern armies.[22] The response was not wholly encouraging. These officers, while recognizing the necessity for some new source of recruiting and appreciating the force of the arguments advanced, yet doubted the expediency of the public proposal of a policy so radical by an officer of prominence. Efforts were made to dissuade Cleburne by pointing out to him the fact that his chances for promotion would probably be destroyed and that his proposal would raise a storm of protest and indignation against him. But Cleburne was not to be dissuaded. He felt that there was a crisis upon the south and was convinced that it could be best averted or ameliorated by the prompt execution of his proposal and, feeling so, he considered it his duty to bring the matter forcibly to the attention of the Richmond authorities. He considered that, with reasonable and careful drilling and

[20] *Ibid.*, 3: 4467.

[21] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 52: part 2: 686 ff.

[22] *Ibid.*

with competent officers, negroes would make brave, efficient, and reliable soldiers; he declared that, though he would with great reluctance give up the command of his splendid division, he was yet willing to do so and would cheerfully undertake the organization and drilling of a negro division should his plan be adopted.[23]

Under his instructions a fair copy of his original draft was made and read to the members of his personal staff for comment and criticism. One of them, Major Calhoun Benham, strongly dissented from the views expressed and proposed to write a reply in opposition. The division brigadiers were then called together, and they almost unanimously approved of and signed the document.[24]

In order to present the plan to the army, General Cleburne, through his corps commander, General W. J. Hardee, sent an invitation to the general officers of all grades, including the commanding general, Joseph E. Johnston, and all the regimental commanders to assemble at army headquarters. On January 2, 1864, General Johnston issued an order to his subordinate officers to assemble at his headquarters at 7 P. M.[25] At the appointed hour all the generals of the army, except General B. F. Cheatham, had assembled at the designated place. General Johnston, who presided, then requested General Hardee to explain the unannounced object of the meeting, which Hardee did by simply stating that General Cleburne had, with great care, prepared a paper on an important subject which he desired to read to the officers of the army.[26] Cleburne then presented his proposal.

After describing the straits in which the confederacy then found itself, because of its long inability to raise and maintain armies sufficient to overcome the federal forces, Cleburne went on to say that "in this state of things it is easy to understand

[23] Irving A. Buck, *Cleburne and his command* (New York, 1908), 211; *Southern historical society papers,* 31: 215.

[24] *Ibid.,* 31: 216; Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 213; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 593.

[25] *Ibid.,* first series, 52: part 2: 595; John W. Du Bose, *General Joseph Wheeler and the army of Tennessee* (New York, 1912), 256; William M. Polk, *Leonidas Polk, bishop and general* (New York, 1915), 2: 342.

[26] *Ibid.,* 2: 341; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 598.

why there is a growing belief that some black catastrophe is not far ahead of us, and that unless some extraordinary change is soon made in our condition we must soon overtake it." He recited an account of past disasters, referred to present conditions and to the inevitable future, and then went on to point out that unless prompt means were adopted, inevitable disaster would surely follow. This "extraordinary change" proposed was, of course, nothing less than "that we retain in service for the war, and that we immediately commence training, a large reserve of the most courageous of our slaves; and further, that we guarantee, within a reasonable time, freedom to every slave in the South who shall remain true to the Confederacy in this war."[27]

Cleburne pointed out the danger of subjugation unless the military situation could be more nearly equalized, with all its attendant humiliation and loss and with the probability of the accusation of perversion of the aims of the southern cause from a fight for a principle and an ideal to a desire to keep the negro in his state of slavery. Slavery had become a military weakness to the confederacy, because of the willingness of slaves in occupied territories to enlist for bounty and emancipation, thereby swelling the ranks of the enemy. The enemy had three sources of supply for recruiting his forces: "his own motley population, the slaves of Southerners and Europeans, whose hearts are fired with a crusade against us by fictitious pictures of slavery." England and France could not help the south without helping slavery. Emancipation of the slaves and their wholesale enlistment in the confederate armies would "strip the enemy of foreign sympathy and assisstance [*sic*] and transfer them to the South; will dry up two of his three sources of recruiting; it will take from his negro army the only motive it can have to fight against the South. . . . The necessity for more fighting men is upon us. We can only get a sufficiency by making the negro share the danger and hardship of the war. If we arm him and train him and make him fight for the country, every consideration of principle and policy demands that we shall set him and his whole race, who side with us, free. . . . Satisfy the negro that if he faithfully adheres to our standard during the war he shall receive his freedom and that of his race;

[27] *Ibid.*, first series, 52: part 2: 586 ff.

give him as an earnest of our intentions such immediate immunities as will impress him with our sincerity and be in keeping with his new condition; enroll a portion of his class as soldiers of the Confederacy and we change the race from a dread menace to a position of strength." Such action, besides depriving the north of the moral and material aid "due to the bitter prejudices of foreign nations against slavery . . . would strike dead all . . . fanaticism, cut away from its negro army the only material it could have to fight against the South," and "instantly remove all the vulnerability, embarrassment and inherent weakness which result from slavery."[28]

In conclusion, General Cleburne referred to the adaptability of the negro as displayed in the federal armies and elsewhere, saying that "If they can be made to face and fight bravely against their former masters, how much more probable is it that with the allurement of a higher reward, and led by those masters, they would submit to discipline and face dangers?" He considered that negroes accustomed to obedience from youth would, under the leadership of their masters, make even better soldiers for the south than they had proved to be, under different principles of organization, for the north. He insisted that it was the duty of the southern people to waive considerations of property and prejudices of caste and bring to their aid this powerful auxiliary, as, in case of final defeat, they would lose both.

General Cleburne presented his case with great ability and with clearness and eloquence. Taking the assembled officers by surprise, the proposal created a profound sensation; as the meeting dissolved wide differences of opinion developed. A favorite officer, Major-General W. H. T. Walker, a Georgian, announced his condemnation on the spot and characterized the proposal as incendiary. General Johnston and General Hardee seemed to agree with Cleburne's proposal, but expressed no opinion, and much to Cleburne's disappointment General Johnston, though favorably disposed in the matter, declined to forward the paper to the war department on the ground that it was more a political than a military matter.[29]

[28] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 586 ff.

[29] Du Bose, *General Joseph Wheeler and the army of Tennessee,* 257; Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 213; *Southern historical society papers,* 31: 158, 217.

Major Calhoun Benham, a member of Cleburne's staff, who had had an opportunity of examining the paper before its presentation at the meeting, read a dissenting opinion. Major-General J. Patton Anderson, a Floridian, wrote at once to his friend, Lieutenant-General Leonidas Polk, then absent in Mississippi, bitterly resenting the suggestion and characterizing it as an "unnecessary and disgraceful surrender of the whole question at issue." He urged General Polk to interfere lest "the South . . . listen to the voices of those who would ask her to stultify herself" by entertaining such a proposition. He did not feel that the condition of the confederacy required resort to such radical and unheard-of measures.[30] Because of the press of official business, General Polk's reply was delayed and, if made, no record of it has been found. Soon after the meeting General Walker wrote to General T. C. Hindman, one of the division commanders present at the meeting, asking for a written expression of opinion and a statement of his position.[31] Hindman in his reply, dated January 9, 1864, refused to discuss the matter except on order of the government, maintaining that such a course would conflict "with a distinct agreement of privacy among the officers consulted by General Cleburne."[32] The next day General Walker wrote General Cleburne, stating that the paper was of such a dangerous ("incendiary") character that he felt it his duty (General Johnston having refused to do so) to report the matter to President Davis. He requested Cleburne to furnish him with a copy of the memorial together with an avowal of its authorship. Cleburne at once complied with both these requests. Walker then applied to General Johnston for permission to send the memorial through the proper official channels; this authority was declined by General Johnston "for reasons satisfactory to himself." General Walker then forwarded the memorial directly to President Davis.[33]

Communication with Richmond was slow and uncertain. General Cleburne was naturally somewhat anxious as to the final

[30] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 598.

[31] *Ibid.,* first series, 52: part 2: 593.

[32] *Ibid.,* first series, 32: part 2: 537.

[33] *Ibid.,* first series, 52: part 2: 595; *Southern historical society papers,* 31: 217; Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 313, 365.

outcome of the affair, though he had no regrets and was convinced of the propriety of his course and of the efficacy of the plan proposed. He felt that the worst that could happen to him would be a court-martial and dismissal, in which case he would at once enlist in his old regiment, the fifteenth Arkansas infantry, then assigned in his division.[34] Finally, however, after some weeks, the paper was returned, endorsed by President Davis substantially as follows: "While recognizing the patriotic motives of its distinguished author, I deem it inexpedient, at this time, to give publicity to this paper and request that it be suppressed."[35] Upon receipt of this information General Cleburne directed that all copies of the memorial be destroyed except the one returned from Richmond. This copy was subsequently captured and burned during the Atlanta campaign and none were thought to be in existence. In 1897, however, Major Calhoun Benham died and among his effects was discovered the copy of the memorial given him previous to the meeting and afterwards retained in his possession.[36]

President Davis' request that Cleburne's memorial "be suppressed" coincided with other opinions expressed at the time. General Patton Anderson, in his letter to General Polk, wrote that "If this thing is once openly proposed to the army, its total disintegration will follow in a fortnight, and yet to speak and work in opposition to it is an agitation of the question scarcely less to be dreaded. . . . It will bring down the universal indignation of the Southern people upon the head of at least one of our bravest and most accomplished officers."[37] General Walker in his communication to President Davis stated that "the further agitation of such sentiments and propositions would ruin the efficiency of our army and involve our cause in ruin and disgrace."[38] By order of the president, James A. Seddon, Davis' mouthpiece and secretary of war, wrote to General Johnston in vigorous denunciation and "deeply deprecated . . . the agi-

[34] Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 213; *Southern historical society papers,* 31: 217.

[35] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 596.

[36] Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 214; *Southern historical society papers,* 31: 217.

[37] Polk, *Leonidas Polk, bishop and general,* 2: 343; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 598.

[38] *Ibid.,* first series, 52: part 2: 595; Buck, *Cleburne and his command,* 365.

tation," saying that the paper must "be suppressed, discussion of it forbidden and the press denied circulation" of it. General Johnston, in a circular letter to those present at the meeting, dated January 31, 1864, and which was essentially a quotation of Seddon's remarks, communicated these views, stating that "the measures advocated . . . are considered too little appropriate for consideration in military circles. . . . Such views can only jeopard, among the states and people, unity and harmony," at the same time advising Seddon of his action.[39]

These sentiments were undoubtedly, at the time, those of most of the general officers present and also of a large portion of the rank and file.[40] These men entered the war far less with a desire for a separate government than for the right to manage their own affairs; and while their individual preferences undoubtedly favored the ultimate freeing of the negro, they regarded this as a step belonging exclusively to themselves, by states, and one in which they should be free to act without outside, that is, governmental, dictation or interference. The commercial aspect of emancipation was, to them, the least element in the problem of slavery. Many felt that the adoption of the proposed plan would have taken the very core out of the principle for which they were fighting.[41]

It has been stated that Cleburne's plan contemplated the intermingling in the ranks of the blacks with the whites in order to give moral support to the negro soldiers; and this plan of intermingling has been characterized as "the grave and insuperable objection" to Cleburne's proposal — a proposal which incidentally cost him his well-earned and deserved promotion to fill the vacancy made by the death of Lieutenant-General Leonidas Polk during the Atlanta campaign, on June 14, 1864.[42] It is not apparent from an examination of Cleburne's memorial, however, that he contemplated any such scheme. Common sense would have told him that any such organization taken in con-

[39] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 606, 608; Polk, *Leonidas Polk, bishop and general,* 2: 340.

[40] *Ibid.;* letter to the author from Judge J. P. Young of Memphis, Tennessee, May 29, 1918.

[41] Polk, *Leonidas Polk, bishop and general,* 2: 340; Du Bose, *General Joseph Wheeler and the army of Tennessee,* 259.

[42] Mississippi historical society, *Publications* (Centenary series—Jackson, 1913), 1: 550, 552, 559.

nection with his proposal, involving as it did a radical departure from the accepted policy, would be only adding insult to injury. His plan failed to receive consideration because the government and the public were not yet convinced of the need for its adoption. A spring campaign was about to be inaugurated in Virginia and Georgia and far-reaching and favorable results were anticipated. Public opinion and inborn prejudice were against the adoption of any policy involving such extensive economic and social readjustments, and hopes for an early and conclusive victory were still illusions that conjured the public and government imaginations to the exclusion of hard and irrefutable facts.

In spite of all precautions, news of Cleburne's plan escaped camp and made a profound impression throughout the confederacy. Slaveholders and non-slaveholders alike were in general violently opposed to the measure on the ground that they were not fighting for the perpetuation of slavery, but for the right to manage their own affairs. They held to the old democratic tradition of state rights government and many of them felt that if President Davis favored such a scheme as that proposed they would abandon the fight and return to the federal union on any terms. Some contended that if the plan was adopted, the confederacy would, in fact, become a recruiting agent for the federal armies and that the plan would fail because the negroes would not support it—instead they would turn their guns against their former masters.[43]

Cleburne entertained no such doubts. He felt that the general sentiment of the world was against the confederacy on the question of slavery and that southerners could look nowhere for active sympathy and support unless some workable solution of the question was reached. A foreigner by birth and education, he naturally had a cosmopolitan rather than a purely narrow and local viewpoint. In a letter written to his brother Robert in April, 1861, Cleburne had said: "I hope to see the Union preserved by granting the South the full measure of her constitutional rights," and on May 7, 1861: "I am with the

[43] Du Bose, *General Joseph Wheeler and the army of Tennessee*, 259; Charles E. Nash, *Biographical sketches of Gen. Pat R. Cleburne and Gen. T. C. Hindman; together with humorous anecdotes and reminiscences of the late war* (Little Rock, 1898), 191; Polk, *Leonidas Polk, bishop and general*, 2: 341; *Southern historical society papers*, 31: 158.

South in life or in death, in victory or in defeat, I never owned a slave and care nothing for them, but these people have been my friends and have stood by me on all occasions."[44] In common with many Irish immigrants he believed that slavery, in itself, was wrong and that steps should be taken looking towards its gradual abolition. He believed that neither the circumstances of the country nor the capacity, character, and training of the negroes suited them for sudden emancipation, but he was, nevertheless, in favor of gradual and prudent abolition and the final extinction of an institution which he felt to be the cause of grave social injury and a fruitful source of political trouble. He based his stand, however, on the fundamental principles of state sovereignty. Though he did not feel that the abolition of slavery was, in itself, worth the torrents of blood that had been shed in its accomplishment, he yet welcomed President Lincoln's emancipation proclamation. This feeling, however, did not in any way affect his loyalty to the confederacy nor compromise his position, for he had taken sides not to perpetuate the institution of slavery but to vindicate and uphold the doctrine of state rights.[45]

It may be seriously doubted whether Cleburne's plan, had it been adopted at the time of its suggestion, would have been successful. Realizing that it would require time to secure the approval of the people and of congress and to gather together and train the authorized levies, Cleburne pointed out at the time of his presentation of the proposition that if any favorable action was to be taken, it should be taken promptly; the plan, he thought, should be presented to the public and should be "urged earnestly by every man who believes in its efficiency." He further stated: "Negroes will require much training; training will require time and there is danger that this concession to common sense may come too late."[46] Some years afterward General J. B. Hood wrote: "He [Cleburne] was a man of equally quick perception and strong character and was, in one respect, in advance of our

[44] Letters in the possession of Mrs. Isabella Cleburne Connelly of Huntington, West Virginia (1918).

[45] Nash, *Biographical sketches of Gen. Pat R. Cleburne and Gen. T. C. Hindman,* 190 ff.; John F. Maguire, *The Irish in America* (New York, 1867), 367.

[46] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 52: part 2: 593.

people. He possessed the boldness and wisdom to earnestly advocate . . . the freedom of the negro and enrollment of the young and able-bodied men of that race. This stroke of policy and additional source of [military] strength would, in my opinion, have given us our independence."[47]

Throughout the year 1864 the proposition of using negroes as soldiers was a matter of general talk and in some quarters there was bitter opposition.[48] The fall of Atlanta, the deadlock in Virginia, the permanent splitting in half of the confederacy on the line of the Mississippi and the imperative necessity for recruits focused public and official attention on this absorbing question. The matter was discussed in the army and at home around troubled firesides. Like a black cloud, it hung over all confederate thought of the war. Letters written from the trenches at Petersburg and from the armies in Georgia and Tennessee show that it was debated by the soldiers, and the intense repugnance which the idea inspired in some minds was shown by the threats to leave the ranks if the slaves were armed and enrolled as soldiers. The idea of negro soldiers became one of the burning questions of the hour and helped to focus the violent anti-Davis movement which was the conspicuous event of December, 1864, and January, 1865.[49]

In a letter dated September 26, 1864, to J. A. Seddon, secretary of war, Governor Henry W. Allene of Louisiana, who had served as a general officer in Virginia under "Stonewall" Jackson, wrote: "The time has come for us to put in the army every able-bodied negro man as a soldier. Congress should, at the coming session, take action in this most important question. . . . I would free all able to bear arms and put them in the field at once. . . . They will make much better soldiers with us than against us."[50]

[47] John B. Hood, *Advance and retreat: personal experiences in the United States and Confederate States armies* (New Orleans, 1880), 296.

[48] *American historical review,* 18: 295; Edward A. Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis, with a secret history of the southern confederacy, gathered "behind the scenes in Richmond." Containing curious and extraordinary information of the principal southern characters in the late war, in connection with President Davis, and in relation to the various intrigues of his administration* (Philadelphia, [1869]), 448.

[49] Nathaniel W. Stephenson, *The day of the confederacy* (New Haven, 1919), 183 ff.; Mississippi historical society, *Publications,* 1: 551 ff.

[50] *Ibid.,* 1: 556; *Southern historical society papers,* 35: 333.

On October 13, 1864, the governors of the two Carolinas, Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi formally met at Augusta, Georgia, to discuss among other matters the question of enlisting the slaves in the army. The meeting passed a resolution of sympathy with Cleburne's memorial. Governor T. H. Watts of Alabama, however, who for two years had been attorney-general in the president's cabinet, was not present, having been suddenly called home before action was taken by his associate governors. When the Alabama general assembly met in November, Governor Watts informed the body of the action of the Augusta meeting and of his unqualified condemnation of the resolution. He could discover no emergency of the confederacy calling for emancipation of the slaves and their enrollment in the armies of the confederacy.[51]

At the time of Governor Watts' optimistic statements, the general assembly was in great straits for money to feed the destitute families of soldiers. Hood had evacuated Atlanta and had begun his wrecking career in Tennessee, and General Lee in Virginia was hard put to it in fending off Grant's repeated and steadily more forceful blows against the army defending Richmond. Governor Watts, it should be said, had come to his office from President Davis' cabinet with the views of that cabinet and of the chief executive regarding this question as an essential part of his mental equipment.

As the year 1864 drew to a close the situation and the outlook for the confederacy became steadily more desperate. Some plan of reënforcement had to be formed in order to fill the rapidly-thinning ranks. Sherman was advancing through Georgia to the sea and Lee, miles away from his base, was facing Grant, with his daily increasing forces, in a forlorn hope. No aid could be expected from Europe as long as the perpetuation of slavery seemed to be one of the consequent results of confederate success.[52] A variety of schemes, not excepting a dictatorship,

[51] Du Bose, *General Joseph Wheeler and the army of Tennessee,* 259; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, pp. 11, 196, 202. For a copy of the resolutions adopted see *ibid.,* 1864, p. 196. It is interesting to note in this connection the action of the Alabama assembly in the preceding summer (August 29, 1863) in recommending the propriety of considering action in this matter of arming the slaves. At that time John G. Shorter was governor. *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 2: 767.

[52] Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850,* 5: 60 ff.

merged gradually into the absorbing "last ditch" question: "Shall we arm the slaves?" There was widespread anxiety on the subject. The *Journal of the confederate congress,* the *Official records of the union and confederate armies,* newspaper files, and personal memoirs and recollections all confirm the tradition that the subject was generally discussed, with widely varying opinions, during this last winter of confederate history. The question parted itself into three distinct alternatives: Should the slaves be given arms under any circumstances? If used as soldiers, should they be promised emancipation? Should action be taken by the confederate government or should the matter be acted upon by each state government individually? The question was further complicated by the popular suspicion that the president was aiming at a dictatorship, for had he not asked for a suspension of the writ of habeas corpus? [53]

After the return of President Davis from his tour of observation and inspection, which included a visit to Hood's army at Palmetto, Georgia, in the last week of September, 1864, he seems to have begun to realize that new and more drastic steps for recruiting the armed forces of the confederacy were necessary, but he was not yet prepared to recommend the use of slaves as soldiers. In his message to the confederate congress of November 7, 1864, he said: "I must dissent from those who advise a general levy and arming of the slaves for duty as soldiers. Until our white population shall prove insufficient for the armies we require and can afford to keep in the field, to employ as a soldier, the negro, . . . would scarcely be deemed wise or advantageous by any and this is the question now before us. But should the alternative ever be presented of subjugation or of the employment of the slaves as soldiers, there seems no reason to doubt what should be our decision." [54] Mr. Davis had suggested (November 7, 1864) that slaves "might be advantageously employed as laborers" to the extent of 40,000 men, but "beyond this limit and these employments it does not seem

[53] Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review,* 18: 296; Louis Pendleton, *Alexander H. Stephens* (American crisis biographies — Philadelphia, 1907), 312 ff.; William E. Dodd, *Jefferson Davis* (American crisis biographies — Philadelphia, 1907), 323 ff.; *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 263 (November 9, 1864).

[54] *Ibid.,* 4: 258 (November 7, 1864).

to me desirable, under existing circumstances, to go."[55] Though the president was coming to realize the extreme gravity of the situation and was cautiously feeling his way, he was not yet committed to public advocacy of the use of negroes as soldiers. His secretary of war could see no emergency. On September 29, 1864, "A Native Georgian" had written him from Augusta, Georgia, suggesting the use of negroes as soldiers and on October 6 Seddon endorsed his reply saying in substance that such a radical departure from previous policy was unnecessary.[56] On November 3, 1864, in his annual report to the president, Seddon wrote: "My own judgment does not yet either perceive the necessity or approve the policy of employing slaves . . . as soldiers"; continuing later to discuss the illegality of any move in this direction.[57]

On November 7, 1864, W. G. Swan of Virginia introduced a resolution into the house setting forth the statement "That in the judgment of this House no emergency now exists or is likely to occur . . . which demands that negroes shall be placed in service as soldiers in the field."[58] This resolution may have been drawn to forestall President Davis' remarks in his annual message of the same date in which he suggested that negroes "might be employed as pioneer and engineer laborers" to the extent of 40,000 men[59] and also to put the house on record as being opposed to any extensive military use of negroes as soldiers. The resolution was deferred to November 10 for consideration before the house.[60] On November 8 Mr. H. S. Foote of Tennessee introduced a long resolution referring to the use of negroes, which among other matters, resolved that " the 'general levy and arming of the slaves for the duty of soldiers' would be inexpedient."[61] On November 10, the day appointed for discussion of the resolutions (the meeting was a secret session) no record or detailed and definite statement of consideration of these resolutions is found in the journals of the confed-

[55] *Ibid.*, Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, 6: 486.

[56] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 3: 693.

[57] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 3: 762, 768 ff.

[58] *Journals of the confederate congress*, 7: 247.

[59] *Ibid.*, 7: 255.

[60] *Ibid.*, 7: 248.

[61] *Ibid.*, 7: 261.

erate congress. On the same day, however, a resolution by H. C. Chambers of Mississippi, which had been introduced on November 7, was taken up in which it was stated that "our citizen soldiers . . . will continue a sufficient guaranty of . . . independence," and the house "spent some time" considering it. The discussion was long and bitter, so long, in fact, that all the time of the session was consumed in discussing it and none was left in which to consider the resolutions offered by Swan and by Foote which were to come up in order of presentation after Chambers' resolution had been disposed of.[62]

Referring particularly to the employment of negroes as soldiers Chambers said that he was "ashamed to debate the question. All nature cries out against it. The negro was ordained to slavery by the Almighty. Emancipation would be the destruction of our political and social system. God forbid that this Trojan horse should be introduced among us." Goode of Virginia was opposed to the suggested use of the negroes because it was "a confession of weakness to the enemy"; because he thought "it would end in abolition"; and because it was "degrading to our men."[63] This speech seems to have ended the discussion, for at 2:15 P. M. the house went into secret session to consider a bill reported from the judiciary committee, and the resolutions of Swan and Foote do not appear to have been again considered.[64]

About this time, Judah P. Benjamin, the confederate secretary of state, had made up his mind as to the imperative need for using slaves as soldiers. He favored the liberation of the slaves; he saw two steps which might follow the adoption of such a policy and hoped for a third—independence. The first result of such a move would, it was hoped, be foreign recognition of the confederacy. The second was the liberation of the negroes on condition of their enlistment in the army and fighting to the close of the war. It was hardly doubted that the blacks would fight for their freedom and if they did not prove as courageous as the veteran white soldiers, they could, at least, be distributed among them for the necessary moral support and example.

[62] *Journals of the confederate congress*, 7: 268; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1864, p. 217.

[63] *Ibid.*, 1864, p. 216.

[64] *Ibid.*, 1864, p. 217; *Journals of the confederate congress*, 7: 268.

Benjamin, however, found it difficult to convince President Davis that such a radical step was necessary or that the plan could be made effective and it was only when backed by the great force of General Lee's tacit approval, later expressed in writing, of the plan and the increasingly desperate situation in which the government found itself that the president was at last prevailed on to give his official approval.[65]

From the early autumn there had been much public discussion, pro and con, of such a plan, but it was largely speculative and general, and several months from the time of its first consideration elapsed before such a measure became a probability and a subject for more than academic argument. The public mind had to be brought, by degrees, to the calm and unprejudiced consideration of a reform so radical. It had "to be delicately managed to support so great a surprise and to put itself on familiar terms with so thorough a change of its traditions and old associations."[66] As against the arguments favoring such a policy, it was said that the measure would be virtually to stake success in the war on the capacity and fidelity of negro troops; that they would desert at every opportunity; that the white soldiers would refuse to serve with them and that their introduction into the army would be the signal of disaffection and mutiny; that the proposed liberation of the slaves to become soldiers was to give up one of the most important objects of the war; that it would be a confession of weakness; and that it would, in effect, be a resort to a low and dishonorable alliance.[67]

As the winter passed the agitation gathered force. President Davis' message of November 9, 1864, was interpreted as a "feeler" to take the sense of the country relative to a plan already decided upon. The *Charleston Mercury,* a bitter opponent of the president, took it for granted that Davis had already made up his mind. Governor William Smith of Virginia, who appears to have arrived at the same conclusion, and who spoke favorably of the measure, was also sharply criticized.[68] The defeat of Hood caused a natural increase of interest in all schemes to

[65] Dodd, *Jefferson Davis,* 343.

[66] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis,* 447.

[67] *Ibid.,* 448 ff.

[68] *Charleston Mercury,* December 12, 1864, quoted in Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review,* 18: 297.

reënforce the army, and a Richmond correspondent wrote that, as a consequence, the question of raising negro troops was receiving favorable consideration.[69] Judah P. Benjamin, himself, on December 21, 1864, wrote of the ripening sentiment in favor of the use of negroes as soldiers.[70] But congress was obdurate. From January 24 to February 3, 1865, separate resolutions were adopted condemning the use of negroes as soldiers. On February 1, 1865, a resolution was proposed which maintained that it was the judgment of the house that this spectre could be laid "by ceasing to agitate the policy of employing negro troops, a measure which has already divided public sentiment and produced much despondency."[71]

In the meantime, however, pressure of all sorts was being brought to bear on the matter. In the state of Virginia this proposed revolutionary departure from previous policy was taken up and made the basis of a political program by its embodiment in his message to the legislature by Governor William Smith, a former general officer in the army. He was explicit on the subject of arming the slaves and of giving freedom to those who enrolled as soldiers. He added: "Even if the result were to emancipate our slaves, there is not a man who would not cheerfully put the negro into the army rather than become a slave himself to our hated and vindictive foe. It is, then, simply a question of time. Has the time arrived when this issue is fairly before us? For my part, standing before God and my country, I do not hesitate to say that I would arm such portion of our able-bodied slave population as may be necessary, and put them in the field, so as to have them ready for the spring campaign, even if it resulted in the freedom of those thus organized. . . . Can we hesitate, can we doubt, when the question is, whether the enemy shall use our slaves against us or we them against him; when the question may be between liberty and independence on the one hand, or subjugation and utter ruin on the other?"[72] With their governor as leader for the administra-

[69] *Charleston Mercury,* January 4, 1865.

[70] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 959.

[71] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 7: 494, 507, 526, 535.

[72] Stephenson, *The day of the confederacy,* 186; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 915 (December 7, 1864).

tion, the Virginians found this issue the absorbing topic of the hour.

General Lee reënforced Governor Smith's appeal by adding his great influence in support of the project. In a letter of January 11, 1865, to Andrew Hunter, a senator of the Virginia legislature, replying to a request for an expression of opinion, he discussed the matter "with admirable penetration and lucidity."[73] Though still holding that slavery, under the existing social conditions, was the best solution of the race problem in the south, he concluded that military necessity compelled its abandonment. Negro troops were sorely needed, as the available supply of recruits from the white race had practically reached the vanishing point; the natural reward of faithful military service must be emancipation, followed, eventually, by the total abolition of slavery. He wrote: "I think . . . we must decide whether slavery shall be extinguished by our enemies and the slaves used against us, or use them ourselves at the risk of the effects which may be produced upon our social institutions . . . in my opinion, the best means of securing the efficiency and fidelity of this auxiliary force would be to accompany the measure with a well-digested plan of gradual and general emancipation. As that will be the result of the continuance of the war, and will certainly occur if the enemy succeed, it seems to me most advisable to adopt it at once and thereby gain all the benefits that will accrue to our cause."[74]

Congress still delayed, but on February 6, the forensic battle opened. Moore of Kentucky moved, in the house, to "inquire into the expediency" of calling "into military service . . . able bodied negro men." An attempt to table the motion was defeated by a close vote, after which it was referred to the committee on military affairs.[75] In February after the peace commissioners had returned from their fruitless mission to Fort Monroe, at a meeting in the African church in Richmond, Judah P. Benjamin, in his last political speech, and perhaps voicing the sentiments and wishes of the president, came out strongly in behalf of the policy of emancipat-

[73] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 3: 1007, 1012.

[74] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 3: 1012.

[75] *Journals of the confederate congress*, 7: 542.

ing and arming the negroes, saying: "Let us say to every negro who wishes to go into the ranks, on condition of being made free, 'go and fight — you are free.'" Whether the negroes would make satisfactory soldiers, he was at least convinced that "There is no harm in trying."[76] The next day a bill was introduced into the house by E. Barksdale of Mississippi "to increase the military force of the Confederate States" and having for its object the congressional authorization of the employment of negroes as soldiers; it was immediately referred to a "select committee of one (member) from each state" "for consideration and report."[77] The putting forward of Benjamin, who was extremely unpopular and the "most obnoxious of all [the cabinet]," as spokesman for the administration, did not help to make matters smoother, but only served to irritate congress.[78] Relations between this body and the president were never any too cordial. Resolutions introduced into the house, February 15, which pooled a one-third affirmative vote, severely censured and condemned Benjamin for his remarks concerning congress and the army,[79] and on February 13, the senate divided evenly on a resolution "declaring that the retirement of the Honorable Judah P. Benjamin from the State Department, will be subservient to the public interests."[80] It seems that it would have been better had some more popular and acceptable spokesman been selected to advocate publicly the proposed change of policy.

On February 7, a resolution had been introduced into the senate by A. G. Brown of Mississippi "to take into the military service . . . a number of negro soldiers, not to exceed 200,000 by voluntary enlistment . . . or by conscription" and providing for "emancipation . . . in all cases where they [the negroes] prove loyal and true to the end of the war." This resolution was immediately voted down by a large majority.[81] Three days later a bill to provide for the raising of 200,000 negro

[76] Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin,* 351; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1865, p. 192.

[77] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 7: 562.

[78] John B. Jones, *A rebel war clerk's diary at the Confederate States capital* (Philadelphia, 1866), 2: 444.

[79] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 7: 582.

[80] *Ibid.,* 4: 550 ff.

[81] *Ibid.,* 4: 526, 528.

troops was introduced.[82] A week later, February 17, an amendment empowering the war department to manumit slave soldiers, providing it had the consent of the state in which the slaves at the time happened to be, was considered, but after some discussion it was postponed indefinitely by the close vote of 11 to 10.[83] Years afterward Davis made the assertion that "a chief obstacle" to the adoption of this bill was the opposition of Senator R. M. T. Hunter of Virginia. Hunter replied saying: "I wish I could have defeated it ['that ill-starred measure'] altogether."[84] And yet Hunter's influence had to compete with the known fact that Lee favored arming and freeing the negro.

The introduction of these resolutions and bills into the house and senate forced the issue on the three fundamental points involved. They proposed to arm the slaves; to promise them freedom; and to commit the whole matter to the discretion of the confederate government. Davis, by this time, was probably ready to give his full support to the house resolution, but the majority of congress were not so minded.[85]

While the lawmakers hesitated and considered, public opinion, which was far in advance of its representatives in congress, earnestly urged that immediate action be taken. General Lee was behind the measure, but Davis was as yet silent. Benjamin wrote Lee (February 11) with regard to the "necessity for instant reënforcement of your army" proposing "that those slaves only who might volunteer, should be at once sent to the trenches" and adding that the proposition had met with "decided favor at the meeting" in the African church on February 9. Lee's opinion was solicited, Benjamin concluding, "if we could get from the army an expression of its desire to be reenforced by such negroes as . . . will volunteer . . . the measure will pass without further delay."[86] This, in fact,

[82] *Ibid.*, 4: 543.

[83] *Ibid.*, 4:585.

[84] *Southern historical society papers*, 4: 209, 313.

[85] Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review*, 18: 298.

[86] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 2: 1229.

seems to have been the generally-accepted opinion of official Richmond.[87]

On February 16, General Longstreet, commanding the first corps of the army of northern Virginia, at Lee's request issued a circular letter to his division commanders, asking them to ascertain the opinion of their respective commands regarding the proposition; and on February 18, General J. B. Gordon, commanding the second corps of Lee's army, apparently in answer to a similar request from headquarters, advised that "the officers and men of this corps are decidedly in favor of the voluntary enlistment of the negroes as soldiers. But few have been found to oppose it."[88] Barksdale had on February 12 also written Lee for an opinion in the matter; on February 18 Lee replied: "I think the measure not only expedient but necessary. The enemy will certainly use them against us if he can get possession of them. . . . In my opinion, the negroes . . . will make efficient soldiers. . . . I think those who are employed should be freed. It would be neither just nor wise, in my opinion, to require them to serve as slaves."[89] About this time President Davis, too, seems to have become reconciled to the necessity for the proposed measure. In a letter of February 21, he wrote: "It is now becoming daily more evident . . . that we are reduced to choosing whether the negroes shall fight for us or against us" and that all arguments to the contrary were "beside the question."[90]

After the failure of the senate resolution of February 7, the Virginia legislature took matters into its own hands, at least so far as the state of Virginia was concerned. On February 16 it reported a resolution favoring the use of negroes, which was adopted March 4.[91] "At this time public opinion in favor of the measures had become almost unanimous among both citi-

[87] Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary*, 2: 416, 423.

[88] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 2: 1236; 51: part 2: 1063; John B. Gordon, *Reminiscences of the civil war* (New York, 1903), 382; Mississippi historical society, *Publications*, 7: 40 ff.

[89] J. D. McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee* (Atlanta, 1870), 574.

[90] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 3: 1110.

[91] *Ibid.*, first series, 46: part 3: 1315; 51: part 2: 1068; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 193.

zens and soldiers."[92] The Virginia legislature took its cue from the advice contained in Lee's statesmanlike and penetrating letter to Andrew Hunter of January 11, 1865, in which he said: "Considering the relations of master and slave . . . I would deprecate any sudden disturbance of that relation unless it be necessary to avert a greater calamity to both. . . . Whatever may be the effect of our employing negro troops, it cannot be as mischievious as . . . [allowing the enemy] to convert the able-bodied men among them into soldiers and to emancipate all . . . In my opinion the best means of securing the efficiency and fidelity of this auxiliary force would be to accompany the measure with a well-digested plan of gradual and general emancipation." But he was also of the opinion that "whatever measures are to be adopted, should be adopted at once" as "Every day's delay increases the difficulty. Much time will be required to organize and discipline the men."[93] It should be noted that this letter was written January 11, 1865, to a member of the Virginia legislature and that it urged immediate action on that body. No reference is made to congressional action and there was then no certainty that the national body would act at all. The letter to Barksdale, not the letter just quoted, is the one that spurred congress to action.[94] At this time (January 11) Lee was considering only what his state might do. Virginia took action on March 4, as noted, but made no mention of emancipation.[95]

It was in this period that Lee rejected a temptation as great as was ever presented to a popular leader. Circumstantial evidence seems to affirm the tradition that a congressional cabal, dissatisfied with Davis and his associates, particularly Benjamin and Seddon, proposed to Lee some such rôle as that of Cromwell and the long parliament. But Lee, arch-idealist that he was, preferred for himself, politically speaking, his splendid isolation at the head of his valiant army. Despite the crisis in Virginia politics, induced by the discussion of the measure con-

[92] *Ibid.*

[93] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1012.

[94] McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee,* 574.

[95] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 46: part 3: 1315; 51: part 2: 1068.

templating the employment of negroes as soldiers, Lee contented himself with drawing up his remarkable "state paper" to Hunter, leaving the execution or rejection of his program to the unembarrassed action of his people.[96] He was, in fact, appointed to the supreme command of the armies of the confederacy.[97] The appointment was to become effective February 6, 1865, in response to a vote of congress on January 21 empowering (ordering) Davis to select and appoint a commander-in-chief of all the armies of the confederacy, by and with the advice (consent) of the senate.[98] But Davis had anticipated congressional action and the intention of congress to take the military control out of his hands. In response to an appeal from the Virginia legislature of January 17, Davis, on January 18, before the appearance of an editorial in the *Richmond Examiner* which suggested that Lee be invested with "absolute military power to make all appointments and direct campaigns," had written to Lee offering him the position.[99] The army, the press, and the people favored Lee's supremacy, but Lee absolutely refused, in any way, to violate his subordination to the president.[100] At no time did he stray from the narrow path of duty, as he conceived it, to gratify ambition or for personal gain. Never did the true character of the man shine forth more brilliantly than in these trying and dispiriting last hours of the confederacy.

On February 19 a large public meeting in Mobile, Alabama, urged the use of negroes as soldiers.[101] On February 17 the superintendent of the Virginia military institute, anticipating favorable action by the Virginia legislature, offered the services of the students of that school as instructors for the ne-

[96] Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review*, 18: 306; Dodd, *Jefferson Davis*, 346.

[97] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 2: 1205.

[98] *Journals of the confederate congress*, 4: 477; Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary*, 2: 392.

[99] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 2: 1084, 1091.

[100] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis*, 420; Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary*, 2: 397, 405.

[101] *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 10.

groes.[102] On the other hand, at the meeting of the Georgia legislature at Macon on February 11, Governor Joseph E. Brown, true to form in his constant opposition to President Davis and his administration and always a strong defender of slavery, took the position that "when we establish the fact that they [the negroes] are a military people, we destroy our theory that they are unfit to be free, and when we arm them we abandon slavery."[103] This, in a nutshell, was the conscious or unconscious fundamental objection of all those who opposed the arming of the negroes. It raised before them the spectre of equality, with all the anticipated dangers and consequences of the changed relations. To many, it seemed to infer the equality of the negro with the white man, whereas it was the very lack of equality which was considered by its advocates to be the justification for slavery. It was further argued that the arming of the negroes "cut under the traditions and theories of three generations in the South"; that it negatived "the one essential, exclusive argument" of inequality; that this "*proposed condition* [of making soldiers of negroes] accommodated the fact of the natural inferiority of the negro."[104] The proposed policy was felt to involve "a fatal inconsistency" not only because to be effective it must include emancipation, but because "If the negro was fit to be a soldier, he was not fit to be a slave."[105]

On January 8, 1865, Howell Cobb, writing to Seddon, characterized the use of negroes as soldiers as "the most pernicious idea that has been suggested since the war began," continuing, "you cannot make soldiers of slaves or slaves of soldiers. . . . The day you make soldiers of them is the beginning of the revolution. If slaves will make good soldiers, our whole theory of slavery is wrong." To him it was "a source of deep mortification and regret" that the proposal had the support of General Lee.[106] On the other hand, Edmund Harrison, writing from the

[102] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1093.

[103] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1865, p. 391; Dodd, *Jefferson Davis,* 283; Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary,* 2: 436.

[104] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis,* 453.

[105] *Ibid.,* 254.

[106] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1008. For additional comments on Cobb's attitude see Jones, *Rebel*

scene of disaster (Montgomery, Alabama) to Davis, on January 14, 1865, after discussing Hood's failure in Tennessee, added: "Our resources are yet sufficient, if properly applied, to gain our independence . . . Many now think that you were right in recommending the placing in the service the able-bodied negroes in the field. Better to drill them to fight for us than to fight against us, which they will be made to do if taken by the enemy."[107]

Late in February, Governor Charles Clarke of Mississippi telegraphed to the president that "nothing keeps the negroes from going to the enemy but fear of being put into the Federal army and if it be attempted to put them in ours, all will runaway."[108] In opposition to this belief is the record of a conversation in the fall of 1864, between General Richard Taylor and a negro laborer engaged in constructing fortifications. General Taylor writes: "A fine looking negro, who seemed to be a leader among his comrades, approached me and said: 'Thank you, Massa General, they give us plenty of good victuals; but how you like our work' (on the fortifications). I replied that they had worked very well. 'If you will give us guns we will fight for these works, too. We would rather fight for our own white folks than for strangers.'"[109] The extreme attitude of the opposition was stated by the *Charleston Mercury* in the remark that "if the slaves were armed, South Carolina could no longer have an interest in prosecuting the war."[110]

But to return to congress. The bill (H. R. 367) introduced into the house on February 10 was, after a parliamentary battle over amendments, passed on February 20, two days after Lee wrote his reply to Barksdale. It was on the following day, after

war clerk's diary, 2: 393, and "The correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb," edited by Ulrich B. Phillips, in American historical association, *Annual report,* 1911 (Washington, 1913), 2: 615.

[107] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 45: part 2: 784. President Davis' recommendations probably referred to his advocacy of the use of negroes as laborers on fortifications as teamsters and the like, as mentioned in his message to congress November 7, 1864.

[108] Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary,* 2: 428 (entry of February 26, 1865).

[109] Richard Taylor, *Destruction and reconstruction: personal experiences of the late war* (New York, 1879), 210.

[110] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis,* 452.

receiving this bill from the house, that the senate postponed its own bill indefinitely.[111]

Why the senate abandoned its own bill and took up the house measure is apparent when it is understood that the latter bill evaded the constitutional difficulties involved by the inclusion of any stated scheme of emancipation. The great discussion in the house had ended in the passage of a bill increasing the number contemplated to "300,000 troops, in addition to those subject to military service under existing laws . . . to be raised from such classes of the population, irrespective of color, in each state, as the proper authorities thereof may determine."[112] But, as mentioned, no specific provision for emancipation was included, the act stating explicitly "that nothing . . . shall be construed [in this act] to authorize a change in the relation which the said slaves shall bear to their owners, except by consent of the owners and of the States in which they may reside."[113] The president was authorized to call upon each state for its quota under this law. The senate amended the bill by providing that the levy in any one state should not exceed twenty-five per cent of the state's slave population. The house adopted the amendment and the bill was passed March 9, 1865, twenty-seven days after its introduction by Barksdale.[114]

At this point is encountered, not for the first time, the inexplicable dilatoriness and vacillation of the congress of the confederacy. When every hour was precious congress debated. Columbia had gone up in smoke. Hood's army was a mere shadow of its former self, weakened in numbers and morale by its disastrous winter campaign in Tennessee. Lee's situation was growing desperate. Yet the house bill was kept waiting for fifteen days after it was received by the senate. In this period Sherman reached the borders of North Carolina. On January 3, 1865, an anonymous writer had said that "Our Congress is afraid to move unless they could be assured that the move

[111] McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee,* 574; *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 585, 7: 613.

[112] *Ibid.,* 7: 611; Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln,* 6: 487.

[113] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1161.

[114] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 670; 7: 729.

would be popular."[115] In February, in spite of the growing popular demand for some positive action, in spite of Lee's unqualified support, and in spite of Davis' apparent conversion, congress was still unconvinced and unwilling to act. A satisfactory clue to the actions of the confederate senate may be found in the studied opposition of this body to Davis and his advisers; in the fact that its members would all have been materially affected by the loss of their slaves and property; in the conventional delay of all legislative bodies in enacting laws calling for radical changes of policy; and in the traditional slowness of such bodies to respond to public opinion and to appreciate the pressing needs of a military situation.

Regarding the attitude of the house, it may be said that on March 16, after the bill had been passed by the senate and signed by Davis, its committee on military affairs, to which had been referred that portion of the president's message of March 13 relating to military affairs,[116] reported, with regard to the president's accusation of delay in passing the "negro soldier" bill until the measure had lost much of its value, that first, the president himself had formed no definite opinion regarding the necessity for such action, as stated in his message on November 7, 1864,[117] and that second, Secretary of War Seddon was equally emphatic in his report of November 3, 1864, to the president, in which he said that he "did not either perceive the necessity or approve the policy."[118] It was maintained that "These solemn avowals of deliberate opinion by the President and his War Minister" were "never revoked, changed or modified in any subsequent message" and that congress was thus "left . . . in the position of being compelled to override the judgment of these high functionaries upon a subject about which they are presumed to be fully informed and not likely to fall into error or to delay action."[119] We may take this statement for what it is worth. In the premises, it is an excuse and not a reason. The

[115] "The correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1911, 2: 657.

[116] *Journals of the confederate congress*, 7: 776

[117] *Ibid.*, 4: 253 ff.

[118] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 3: 762, 1147.

[119] *Ibid.*, fourth series, 3: 1147.

confederate congress, as was ever the case, consulted its own desires first and then proceeded to a consideration of measures calculated to promote public safety and welfare. In this matter congress did not reflect the people's wishes, but rather inclined to its usual attitude of opposition to the executive branch of the government. Without the prestige of Lee's support the measure would undoubtedly have been tabled or lost.[120] True to its primary and fundamental conception of duty to the state first and to the nation afterwards, congress, with the support of Lee's expressed opinion, carefully guarded the authority of the states and shut the door against legislative action without state approval.[121] On one point, and that a most vital one, congress did depart from the spirit or letter of Lee's recommendations. It did not specifically provide for emancipation in the bill as passed, but if it did not do this it at least did not set up any obstacles to the future consummation of such a step, leaving the whole matter to the individual discretion of the states. Here, again, the doctrine of state rights was used to relieve congress of responsibility. Throughout the whole matter the fundamental sin of congress must always remain its dilatoriness.

While congress was wrestling with its bill providing for the enrollment of slaves as soldiers, Virginia, following General Lee's lead, had on March 6 dealt with the same issue locally and reached a conclusion, indicating that in the opinion of this body the initiative in legislation with regard to the employment of slaves as soldiers should remain with the separate states.[122] These states, individually, could act in response to the flexible extra-legal powers of public opinion without consideration for the hampering constitutional difficulties that bound congress and without being guided or influenced by the mandates of that body, whose function it was to administer laws, not to create conditions.[123] The passage of the government's measure was hastened by these resolutions in the Virginia legislature. They were virtually instructions to the Virginia representatives in the house

120 McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee,* 574.

121 *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1012, 1161.

122 *Ibid.,* first series, 52: part 1: 1068; 46: part 3: 1315.

123 Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review,* 18: 304.

and senate to get behind the bill and put it through. R. M. T. Hunter, senator from Virginia, in the words of Davis "a chief obstacle" to the senate bill, had been outspoken in his opposition and sincere in his declaration that the central government had no power over the institution of slavery, but that it was reserved to the states, individually, to decide the whole matter. He regarded the passage of the bill as a "confession of despair and an abandonment of the ground on which we had seceded from the old Union. We had insisted that Congress had no right to interfere with slavery . . . and that whenever the two races were thrown together, one must be master and the other slave."[124] He did not believe that the slave should be freed, saying that as long as he was "free to vote from my own convictions, nothing can extort it [the approval of the bill] from me." He, however, voted for its enactment.[125]

Further delay ensued in the transmittal of the enacted legislation to the president for approval and signature. On March 13, Davis wrote Lee that the "bill [was] received from the Congress to-day and was immediately signed."[126] He considered that "The measures for recruiting the army . . . have been insufficient" and urged "additional legislation."[127] His conversion to the policy of using negroes as soldiers seems to have been complete. Jones, in an entry on January 25, 1865, written after Lee's letter to Hunter, asked if it "can be possible that *he* [Lee] has influenced the president's mind on this subject."[128] There is no evidence that Lee did so except by the influence of his opinions as expressed in his letters of January 11, to Hunter, and of February 18, to Barksdale. Davis was forced to acquiescence by circumstances and presumably, in some measure, by the insistent and repeated advice of Benjamin. The question for Davis and his associates from being an economic and political possibility heretofore incapable of conception had become a military necessity. The imperative need for recruits to fill the rapidly-thinning ranks and for an international status of

[124] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 218.

[125] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 671.

[126] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 46: part 2: 1308.

[127] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 704.

[128] Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary,* 2: 398.

belligerency resulting from foreign recognition was put forward as the logical and fundamental justification for this radical change of policy. Davis and Benjamin had reluctantly decided on this desperate last measure as the price of confederate success, but it came too late to be of any practical value.

In a caustic message to congress on March 13, in which he displayed an impatience with and a reproval of congress for its dilatory and apparently indifferent behavior, Davis stated that "much benefit is anticipated from the measure, though far less than would have resulted from its adoption at an earlier date, so as to afford time for organization and instruction during the winter months,"[129] a delay for which Davis, himself, was largely responsible.

With the passage and acceptance of the act, a departure from previous policy "indicative of that vague desperation . . . which caught at straws and did not have nerve enough to make a practical and persistent effort at safety,"[130] all hopes of reviving the war by action of congress faded and disappeared. This measure, vast in conception and of profound public interest, was enacted too late to be of any practical benefit and was, from a legislative standpoint, an utter failure. Congress declined, from the first, to assume any initiative in the matter and only acted under the pressure of public opinion, though not admitting the necessity, the advisability, or the efficacy of the compromise measure finally enacted. "A dwarfed birth" as a "consequence of the excessive labor of debate," handicapped the bill from the first, prevented it from affording any real measure of relief, and doomed it to early impotency and failure. It was absurdly deficient in the most important provision, that relating to emancipation; its wording was ambiguous and its intent doubtful.[131]

Congress had labored to an "impotent and ridiculous conclusion" and had brought forth an "emasculated" measure that "studiously set aside the recommendations of General Lee." The negro "was to be forced to fight for his own captivity."[132]

[129] *Journals of the confederate congress,* 4: 704.

[130] Edward A. Pollard, *Southern history of the war* (New York, 1866), 2: 473.

[131] Gordon, *Reminiscences of the civil war,* 382; Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850,* 4: 81.

[132] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis,* 456; McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General*

In making these criticisms, however, three things must be considered — the guessing of congress as to the exact intentions of Davis and Benjamin; the reality of state patriotism; and the last paragraph of Lee's letter to Barksdale in which he said: "I think the matter [of emancipation] should be left, as far as possible, to the people and the States, who alone can legislate as the necessities of their particular service may require."[133] Lee wrote as a citizen of Virginia. Because he had concluded that emancipation was now the final hope of the south, it does not follow that he would have tolerated enactment of it if attempted by the confederate congress and in defiance of his own state.

With the law as passed it was not reasonable to expect that black troops in any numbers could be raised quickly. Still the effort was made.[134] On March 23, two weeks after the passage of the bill, general order number 14, containing instructions for the recruitment and organization of negro troops, was issued. Though the intent of the act and of the order, prescribing the regulations for "the enlistment of colored persons," is not entirely clear, the general understanding seemed to be that when the negro volunteered as a soldier he became a freedman.[135] The act empowered the president to "ask for and accept from the owners of slaves" the services of such numbers of negroes as he saw fit and if a sufficient number were not offered to "call on each State . . . for her quota . . . to be raised from such classes of the population, irrespective of color, . . . as the proper authorities thereof may determine."[136]

General Lee was authorized to organize the slaves "into companies, battalions and regiments . . . to be commanded by such officers as the President may appoint." No slave was to be "accepted as a recruit unless with his own consent and with the approval of his master" who would agree to confer "as far

Robert E. Lee, 576. For the wording of the act see *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1161.

133 Stephenson, "The question of arming the slaves," in *American historical review,* 18: 303; McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee,* 575.

134 *Ibid.,* 576.

135 Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary,* 2: 450, 451, 457, 461; Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850,* 4: 81; Jefferson Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government* (New York, 1881), 2: 660; *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies,* fourth series, 3: 1161.

136 *Ibid.*

as he may, the right of freedman." The act further provided that there should be no "change in the relations" of the slave to his master "except by consent of the owners and of the State in which they may reside and in pursuance of the laws thereof." It should be noted that the wording of the act and of the regulations contradict each other. The authority of the master to confer the privilege of a freedman on the slave was tantamount to emancipation. This authority, however, was hedged about by restrictions that practically made it valueless. The wording of the act, as it came from congress, was based on political expediency; the wording of the regulation, broadening the interpretation of the act, was based on military necessity.

The contemporary newspapers contain advertisements calling for negro enlistments and letters "poured into the [War] Department . . . asking authority to raise and command" negro troops.[137] Though the recruiting order was issued on March 23, as late as March 27 General Lee wrote the secretary of war saying that he had "been awaiting . . . the order . . . for raising and organizing the colored troops" stating that "recruits may be obtained in Petersburg if suitable persons be employed to get them to enlist."[138] Pollard sarcastically records that "The fruits of this emasculated measure [the act] were two companies organized from some negro vagabonds in Richmond, which were allowed to give balls at the Libby Prison and were exhibited in fine, fresh uniforms on Capitol Square, as decoys to obtain sable recruits. But the mass of the colored brethren looked on the parade with unenvious eyes and little boys exhibited the early prejudices of race by pelting the fine uniforms with mud."[139] This overdrawn picture epitomizes, in a sense, the potential value of the act.

In at least one case a regiment, the forty-ninth Georgia infantry, petitioned General Lee on March 15 to have its ranks filled with conscripted negroes.[140] "A majority of the soldiers were probably (with reservations) in favor of the experiment of negro soldiers." The opposition came in a great measure

[137] Jones, *Rebel war clerk's diary*, 2: 450, 461.

[138] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 3: 1356.

[139] Pollard, *Life of Jefferson Davis*, 456.

[140] *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 2: 1315.

from "the slaveholding interest, in its usual narrow spirit—in its old character of a greedy, vulgar, insolent aristocracy" which determinedly voiced its attitude in the newspapers and before congress.[141]

General Lee had urged Davis and Seddon, and later Breckenridge, to make haste,[142] but it was too late. He "wanted negroes in the fall [of 1864] so that they might be trained to their duties during the winter months, but congress trifled away the time, and the opportunity of making soldiers of the blacks was lost forever."[143] In spite of this fact and notwithstanding the conditions of the act and the probable difficulties of equipment, steps for recruiting the negroes were finally taken and the necessary officers designated throughout the southern states yet remaining unoccupied by the federal forces. The last entry in the official records, dated April 28, 1865, is such an order.[144]

Thus in a little over a year was the proposal as put forth by General Cleburne in his memorial adopted in its essentials, but with the important and vital omission of any expressed provision for emancipation, except "at the discretion of the owners of the slaves and of the states in which they may reside."[145] It is probable, however, that, had it been possible to raise any number of negro troops, their performance in battle would have been such as to have created a strong public sentiment favoring emancipation. Perhaps the law would have been amended to this effect as soon as the fighting qualities of the negro had been demonstrated. Their behavior in the federal armies and, subsequently, in the armies of the United States, has proved beyond a doubt that the negroes, when capably officered, will fight to the death in the face of any odds.

Cleburne did not live to see the consummation of his proposal, as he was killed in the battle of Franklin, Tennessee, November 30, 1864, at the head of his charging division, but he did have the satisfaction of knowing of Davis' conversion to the

141 Pollard, *Southern history of the war*, 2: 472.

142 *War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 46: part 3: 1339, 1356.

143 McCabe, *Life and campaigns of General Robert E. Lee*, 576.

144 *Ibid.; War of the rebellion: official records of the union and confederate armies*, fourth series, 3: 1193.

145 *Ibid.*, fourth series, 3: 1161.

idea, as inferentially deduced from his message to congress on November 7, 1864, and of knowing that the matter had been seriously considered and debated in the confederate congress.

It is not probable that Lee or any of the members of congress knew of Cleburne's plan and of his arguments for its adoption, except in a very general way, as no copies of his memorial were available at the time the matter was definitely and seriously taken up. Cleburne's plan, however, would naturally have suggested itself to any who gave the matter careful thought and who was without preconceived prejudices. Its cornerstone and only guaranty of success was the inclusion of a definite provision for emancipation, in one positive form or another. This provision congress failed to include, even though all the weight of common sense indicated its inclusion as an essential guaranty of the ultimate success of the plan.

Thomas Robson Hay

Pittsburg, Pennsylvania

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE OLD NORTHWEST

Historical work has become so stabilized in the states of the old northwest that there is little to chronicle in the way of new developments in the organizations that direct historical activities. In general, the war had a tendency to shelve all schemes for more aggressive archival work, particularly in the matter of improved housing facilities. The Illinois centennial memorial building at Springfield has been delayed by the war but as excavation is now well advanced, work should go forward expeditiously. Historical workers in the state are strongly urging that the building be converted into a permanent repository for state archives; it will then also furnish quarters for the Illinois state historical society and the Illinois state historical library.

The sixth annual report of the Michigan historical commission for 1918 may be found in the *Michigan history magazine* for January, 1919. In the upper peninsula of Michigan new societies have been formed in Menominee, Mackinac, and Iron counties; all these organizations have been urged to gather the perishable records of local war activities, especially data about their local president called to the colors. The record of a busy year of routine work by the State historical society of Wisconsin may be found in the *Proceedings* of the society at its sixty-sixth annual meeting, held October 24, 1918 (Madison, 1919. 54 p.). The society has secured on appropriation of $2,220 more per year than heretofore; the annual appropriation beginning July 1, 1919, will be $63,200. The Beloit historical society has taken advantage of the Wisconsin statute on the subject to incorporate formally and to enroll as an auxiliary of the state historical society; formal organization with one hundred fifty members was completed at a meeting on December 18, 1918. The State historical society of Wisconsin has recently undertaken an aggressive membership drive and has added eighty members in a period of three months.

The *Annual report* of the Chicago historical society for the

year ending October 31, 1918 (Chicago, 1919. 147 p.), records the various phases of the work of that society. The work of the Illinois state historical society is chronicled in its annual *Transactions*. During the Illinois centennial year this society has been occupied largely with the official observance of the centennial, the president of the society and the secretary occupying the same relative positions in the Illinois centennial commission.

The proceedings of the thirty-third annual meeting of the Ohio archaeological and historical society at Columbus, September 25, 1919, may be found in the October number of the *Quarterly* published by the society. The meeting was devoted to the reports of the officers and committees of the society and of the Ohio historical commission.

It has been the custom of the Indiana historical society not to print its minutes with the papers read before the society's meetings. None of the minutes had been published since the reorganization of the society in 1886 until the publication of the "Minutes of the society, 1886-1918" as number four of volume six of the Indiana historical society *Publications*.

The Historical society of Western Pennsylvania has taken advantage of the growing interest in history stimulated by the war to plan for more aggressive work. During the early half of 1918 the first floor and basement of the society's building were occupied by a chapter of women Red Cross workers and during the last half by military students of the University of Pittsburg. Meantime, the society has been collecting historical data and relics relating to the great war. With the return of normal conditions the society has again called attention to its crowded quarters and is now asking the Pennsylvania legislature for an appropriation to build an addition. The society is coöperating with the history department of Pittsburg and with local literary and historical clubs interested in the study of history. A sketch of the Historical society of Western Pennsylvania, its history, objects, and achievements, by Burd S. Patterson may be found in the January, 1919, number of the new *Magazine* published by the society.

War conditions have created a new need to which all aggressive historical agencies throughout the country have had to divert some attention.

War History Organization

The machinery for the collection of material pertaining to the war has naturally enough been installed as an adjunct of the existing historical agencies. Last year's survey noted the launching of the Wisconsin war history committee and the Ohio historical commission.

The state historical library in Madison has become the headquarters of the war history committee for Wisconsin and from there the work is being directed. A special fund has been provided by the state historical society to care for the war collection and Mr. Asa C. Tilton, a trained bibliographer and historian has been secured to serve as curator. The special drive for war history materials has been conducted in close coördination with the ordinary work of the historical library and of the library and other departments of the Univeristy of Wisconsin. This arrangement has required the coöperation of the county councils of defense, the public libraries, the local historical societies, and the schools. Four bulletins have been issued by the Wisconsin war history committee as follows: "Collect material for Wisconsin's war history now" (revised edition, November, 1918); "Directions for organizing war history committees and collecting material" (November, 1918); "Some further suggestions concerning the collection of county war history materials" (November, 1918); and "Concerning war memorials" (February, 1919). The governor of Wisconsin had planned to send a commission composed of two men, an army officer and the superintendent, Mr. Quaife, to France for the collection of historical data; the plan, however, seems to have been withdrawn. As the work of the state war history committee is now drawing to a logical close, plans are being made to supersede it with a permanent organization. A bill is before the Wisconsin legislature, with every prospect of passage, which provides for a war history commission to which $10,000 annually is to be appropriated for the purpose of compiling an official state history of Wisconsin's part in the world war. The commission is to consist of the superintendent of the state historical society, the adjutant general, the governor *ex officio*, and three citizens appointed by the governor. It is contemplated in a general way that the work will continue four or five years.

The historical commission of Ohio continues its aggressive work, initiated over a year ago, of collecting the Ohio war materials. Many county branches of the commission have been organized. A coöperative arrangement with the Ohio state archaeological and historical society has placed the library building of the society at the disposal of the commission for the deposit of its collections. The first report of Mr. Schlesinger, chairman of the commission, may be found in the October, 1918, issue of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly.*

In Michigan the task of getting together the material concerning that state's part in the war has been undertaken directly by the Michigan historical commission, which has as yet been unable to put special energy into this work.

The state of Illinois is endeavoring to recover from the disadvantage of the late start which it made in organizing for the collection and preservation of materials relating to the great war. Work was begun in the fall of 1918 through a war history committee of the Illinois council of defense. C. W. Alvord of the Illinois state historical library and of the University of Illinois was called into conference and it was finally decided to make an appeal for the collection and preservation of the materials of war history. The Illinois state historical library at Springfield undertook to coöperate with the war history committee and to act as the central depository of war records and other historical material not having any specified or safe place of preservation. Since that time a more adequate plan has been formulated.

There has been added to the usual Illinois state historical library bill a request for an additional appropriation of $10,000 a year for the preservation of war records. If the bills go through it is planned to have two field agents visit all the counties of Illinois to stir up interest in the preservation of war records and to organize the counties for that purpose. No doubt new records will be created since the record of the soldiers' services is not complete; the work will in general follow the same lines as similar undertakings in other states.

In Indiana the systematic collection of war records was begun at a rather late moment but was soon well under way with an aggressive campaign under the auspices of the state historical

commission. Mr. Harlow Lindley, secretary of the commission, is in general charge, but Mr. John W. Oliver, formerly engaged in the same work in Wisconsin, has been made director of the Indiana war history records. The commission has issued two war history bulletins, one dated January, 1919, dealing with *Suggestions for collecting and preserving material for Indiana's war history*, and the other dated March, 1919, entitled *Indiana war records, county war history prospectus*, outlining a plan for the systematic organization of the records of each county.

The coöperative work of the various historical agencies of the northwestern states has resulted in the virtual development of an annual conference of the directors of these agencies. At the 1918 meeting held at Chicago in December, it was agreed that the work of exploring the archives at Washington should be continued; plans were also discussed for coöperating with the historical branch of the general staff of the United States army in the collection and preservation of material relating to the great war.

Acquisition of Source Material

The Wisconsin state historical society has made some important additions to its collections during the past year. Especially valuable are four considerable collections of material for the period prior to the civil war. One is a collection of the papers of Nelson Dewey, first governor of Wisconsin, a bulky collection, largely of routine interest and character. Another item is a collection of the papers of the Reverend Mathew Dinsdale, including three valuable diaries describing his voyage from England to America in 1844, his journey to California as a "forty-niner," and his services as agent of the Christian commission in the civil war; his experience as a young immigrant, as a circuit-riding pioneer preacher, and as a versatile American citizen are described in a series of interesting letters. Another important acquisition is that of a valuable collection of about one thousand letters and documents received by Azel Ladd while serving as state superintendent of public instruction, 1852-1854. The fourth is a collection of papers of John H. Tweedy consisting largely of correspondence received by him when acting as territorial delegate of Wisconsin and at other times during the ante bellum period.

For the later period the society has acquired the civil war diary, in four manuscript volumes, of Lieutenant A. V. Knapp of the tenth Wisconsin infantry; twenty-five civil war letters of De Havre Norton; two hundred civil war letters of E. O. and William A. Kimberly; the Colonel Michael H. Fitch civil war papers; a very large and valuable collection of the papers of George B. Smith of Madison, statesman, politician, legist, and lecturer; an important collection of material in the field of Congregational church history collected by the historical committee of the Congregational church in Wisconsin; and the papers of the late United States Senator Paul Hustings which for obvious reasons are not made available to the public for the present. A mass of material, partly manuscript and partly newspaper and pamphlet, has been located, and the privilege of copying secured, which will necessitate the rewriting of the history of Mormonism in Wisconsin. A considerable number of valuable newspaper files from both within and without the state have been added to the Madison collection.

Through an arrangement with the Michigan historical commission the Wisconsin historical society is copying by photostatic process a letter book volume of the American fur company at Mackinac covering the years 1823-1830. Copies are also being made for the Michigan historical commission, the Library of congress, the Illinois historical survey, the Chicago historical society, and the Minnesota historical society.

The Illinois historical survey of the University of Illinois has acquired transcripts of a group of documents which relate to the history of the mission maintained by the Seminary of Quebec among the Tamaroa Indians of Illinois including a narrative account written by the Abbé Taschereau. The originals of these little-known manuscripts are in the library of Laval university and the transcripts have been made under the direction of the Abbé Nadeau. The survey has also added a number of items to its collection of books on the German element in the west, a collection begun some years ago. Of the other purchases of material made within the year the following are noteworthy: a series of nineteen long autograph letters by Daniel Elston, a land speculator who came to Illinois in the thirties; *Laws for the government of the district of Louisiana passed by the Indiana*

territorial legislature (1804); the *Boston Chronicle*, volume I, 1768; and nine volumes of the *Berks and Schuylkill Journal*, scattered over the period from 1825 to 1844. The Chicago historical society lists its acquisitions in its *Annual report* (pp. 125-140); these include two original La Salle and Tonti manuscripts; a manuscript study of "The polyglot Lutheran church at Chicago and in Cook county, Illinois," by Franz L. Braun, formerly missionary pastor of the French Vaudois Lutherans; twenty-four civil war letters of Daniel B. Holmes; the files of the *Liberty tree*, a monthly publication devoted to the anti-slavery cause, edited and published by Z. Eastman, Chicago, 1843-1845; and volume I of the *Chicago magazine, the west as it is*, edited by Z. Eastman in 1857. Another important acquisition is a portion of a collection of autograph letters dating back to the American revolution gathered by the late Henry C. Van Schaack; the society has also acquired five account books, 1831-1847, of the sutlers of Fort Dearborn. The Illinois state historical library continues each year to make substantial additions to its well-known Lincoln collection.

Developments in the past year have interfered with the collecting activities of the Indiana historical survey. The public speeches of Indiana senators are geing gathered, including a large number by Senators McDonald, Hendricks, Turpie, Morton, and Henry S. Lane, but considerable work still remains to make the collection complete. Newspaper acquisitions include the *Jasper Courier*, 1858 to date, and the *Goshen Democrat*, 1838 to date. The survey is making a collection of books used as texts in the Indiana schools during the past century; nearly three thousand volumes have already been secured.

The Western Reserve historical society has recently added to its collections the private papers and correspondence of Senator Theodore E. Burton.

The new accessions to the Michigan state collection of material are in large part the result of encouraging collectors and writers of history in the cities and counties of the state to bring together valuable papers, documents, and museum objects. The Michigan historical commission has received by gift several valuable collections of manuscript material covering the earlier period of the state's history, among them an interesting group

of letters of ex-Governor J. W. Begole relating to the great fire which swept "the thumb" in 1881.

Publication of Source Material

The historical society of Wisconsin continues its aggressive publication work. Within the year volume 25 of the *Collections,* entitled *An English settler in pioneer Wisconsin,* edited with an introduction and notes by M. M. Quaife (Madison, 1918. 250 p.),[1] has been brought out; it constitutes a valuable contribution to source literature. Volume 26 of the *Collections,* which is the first volume of the Constitutional series, has recently made its appearance under the title *The movement for statehood, 1845-1846,* edited by M. M. Quaife (Madison, 1919).[2] The society continues to work along the lines of the comprehensive plans it has formulated for the continuation of this important work. Shorter source items appear in nearly every number of the *Wisconsin magazine of history.* Within the year autobiographical materials have been presented by Mrs. Lathrop E. Smith in "My recollections of civil war days," and by the Reverend P. Pernin on the forest fires of 1871. A picture of the first United States army is presented through the journal of Captain Samuel Newman, who took part in General St. Clair's disastrous western expedition of 1791. A letter written by Major De Lafayette Wilcox in 1835 describing Chicago's first boom appears in the December, 1918, issue. Part of the German poem of 1847, *"Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland?"* is reprinted in the June, 1918, issue, as well as some letters of Paul O. Hustings concerning the late international crisis. The magazine also reprints from the local papers some of the more striking epistolary accounts of the work of "Badgers in the great adventure" on the battlefields of Europe.

John C. Dean has edited for the Indiana historical society an attractive number containing the journal of his grandfather, Thomas Dean of Deansboro, New York, giving "An account of a journey to Indiana in 1817" (Indiana historical society, *Publications,* vol. 6, no. 2. Indianapolis, 1918). The Indiana state legislature of 1917 provided for the issue of a yearbook similar

[1] Reviewed *ante,* 5: 493.

[2] To be reviewed later.

to those published by other states; the first number has appeared as the *Yearbook of the state of Indiana for the year of 1917,* compiled and published under the direction of James P. Goodrich, governor (Indianapolis, 1918. 883 p.).

The Illinois state historical library will soon issue a volume reprinting the three constitutions of the state. With this volume aggressive work in the publication of source material interrupted by the Illinois centennial and by the war will be resumed along the lines indicated in last year's article. Two volumes reprinting the journal of the constitutional conventions of 1847 and of 1862 and another made up of the papers of Governor Edward Coles are being prepared for press. Arrangements are being made for the publication of a history of the thirty-third ("Prairie") division of the American expeditionary forces which will consist of the records of its activities and an introduction by Colonel Frederic L. Huidekoper; it will probably be the first volume of a new series of *War records collections* of the library. *Pictures of Illinois one hundred years ago,* edited by M. M. Quaife (Chicago, 1918. 186 p.),[3] was last year's volume of the Lakeside classic series, annually distributed by way of Christmas greeting by the publishers, R. R. Donnelley and sons company. The *Illinois Catholic historical review* for January, 1919, publishes a letter of Bishop William Quarter, dated Chicago, November 27, 1846, which was his sixth and last letter to the Leopoldine association in Vienna. A number of letters of importance for Illinois history have been published in the recent numbers of the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society.* The June, 1918, *Records of the American Catholic historical society* continues the diary of Bishop Flaget, edited by Francis P. Siegfried; during the period covered in this issue the bishop was at Bardstown, Kentucky. Numbers 214 and 215 of the *Old south leaflets* contain extracts from the writings of Lincoln under the titles: "Abraham Lincoln on war and peace, 1860-1864" and "Letters and miscellaneous writings of Abraham Lincoln, 1850-1864," both edited by Lawrence V. Roth.

Volume III of the *Marietta college historical collections* has appeared within the year under the editorship of Archer B. Hulbert; it is entitled *Ohio in the time of the confederation*

[3] To be reviewed later.

(Marietta historical commission, 1918. 220 p.).[4] Mr. Hulbert as chairman of the Marietta historical commission is formulating plans for continuing the series which was interrupted by war-time exigencies. The *Quarterly publication of the historical and philosophical society of Ohio* has continued the publication of part of the Follett papers with important letters from Salmon P. Chase, Joseph Medill, Thomas Ewing, and other mid-west leaders. The *Quarterly* has also brought out a miscellaneous collection of military papers from 1787 to 1812 from the Torrence papers. An "Address at Marietta, Ohio, 1858, by Thomas Ewing," edited by C. L. Martzolff, may be found in the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* for April, 1919; the same issue publishes reminiscences of "Temperance and church-building in pioneer days on the Western Reserve," by Justus Newton Brown.

The only important published source material for Michigan which has appeared within a twelvemonth is the continuance of the *Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection* through numbers 7 and 8.

The *Journal of negro history* for January, 1919, presents a group of documents on the northern immigration of the negroes in 1879.

Meetings and Published Transactions

The *Proceedings* of the Mississippi valley historical association for 1916-1917 were issued as an extra number of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for October, 1918. The papers relating to the history of the old northwest are "The value of the memoir of George Rogers Clark as an historical document," by James A. James; "The coming of the circuit rider across the mountains," by W. W. Sweet; "Fur-trading companies of the northwest, 1760-1816," by Wayne E. Stevens; "Pageantry possibilities," by Bernard Sobel; and "Possibilities in state historical celebrations," by Harlow Lindley. The *Proceedings* of the association for 1917-1918 will appear in the extra number for the current year.

The regular 1919 spring meeting of the association was held at St. Louis May 8-10. Papers on the history of the old north-

[4] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 490.

west were read as follows: "Following the westward star," by Chancellor Jenks; "Steamboating on the upper Mississippi after the civil war," by Lester B. Shippee; "Traffic and transportation on the Ohio and the Mississippi before the steamboat," by Wallace W. Carson; "The Jesuit in the Mississippi valley," by Laurence Kenny; and the presidential address, "Western travel, 1800-1820," by Harlow Lindley.

The Ohio valley historical association and the American historical association were compelled by the influenza epidemic to cancel the arrangements that had been worked out for their annual meetings.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois state historical society for 1917 (Springfield, 1917. 184 p.) presents the following papers: "Contemporary vandalism," a study of the forces that influenced Lincoln, by Jenkin Lloyd Jones; "The movement of the population of Illinois," by Ernest L. Bogart; "Illinois and the underground railroad to Canada," by Verna Cooley; "A celebrated Illinois case that made history," *in re* Debs, by Stephen A. Day; "Thomas Beard, the pioneer and founder of Beardstown, Illinois," by P. C. Croll; and "Lincoln and the presidential election of 1864," by Arthur C. Cole.

At the May, 1919, meeting of the Illinois state historical society the following papers were offered: "A memorial of the life and services of Clark E. Carr, late honorary president of the society," by George A. Lawrence; "A sketch of the history of woman's work in the Illinois state council of defense," by Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen; "The life and services of Joseph Duncan, governor of Illinois, 1834-1838," by Elizabeth Putnam; "Some phases of agricultural development of Illinois since the civil war," by Eugene Davenport; "William Murray, trader and land speculator in Illinois," by Anna E. Marks; and "The Scots and their descendants in Illinois," by Thomas C. MacMillan.

The third upper peninsula meeting of the Michigan pioneer and historical society was held jointly with the Marquette county historical society at Marquette, August 21-23, 1918. The following papers were read: "Hon. Peter White," by James Russell; "Hon. Dan H. Ball," by George W. Bates; "Munising in history," by Thomas B. Wyman; "Pioneer days in Munis-

ing," by Mrs. Ella Cox Whitmore; "A critical review of Longfellow's Hiawatha," by William F. Gagnieur; "Some remarks upon the history of the northwest, the upper peninsula, and Marquette county," by John W. Stone; "History of Marquette ore docks," by D. H. Merritt; "The stars and stripes in the Ojibway country," by Charles J. Johnson; "The political history of Marquette county," by E. C. Anthony; and "The iron industry," by J. E. Jopling. Addresses were given on the contemporary international crisis and pioneer reminiscences were indulged in by a group of early settlers. Many of the papers were printed in the *Mining journal* and the *Chronicle* of Marquette.

The midwinter meeting of the Michigan pioneer and historical society was held at Hastings, Barry county, January 22 and 23, 1919, jointly with the Barry county pioneer and historical society and the Thornapple valley pioneer association. The following papers were read: "Historical work after the war," by Augustus C. Carton; "The meaning of the pioneer spirit for the present day," by John R. Gregory; "The founding of the Dutch colony in western Michigan, 1847-1848," by Henry D. Lucas; "Barry county's contribution to the war for democracy," by Philip T. Colgrove; "The needs of our museum," by Mrs. M. B. Ferrey; "War history work in a neighboring county," by Sue I. Silliman; "Early days in Hastings," by Marshall L. Cook; and "High points in the history of Barry county," by C. L. Glasgow. Some of these papers will appear in later numbers of the *Michigan history magazine.*

The State historical society of Wisconsin has just published the *Proceedings* of the society at its sixty-sixth annual meeting, held October 24, 1918 (Madison, 1919. 54 p.). The *Proceedings* became in 1917 a formal report of the society's activities no longer including the papers read at the meetings of the society. A joint meeting of the Wisconsin academy of science, arts, and letters with the Wisconsin archeological society was held in the assembly room of the state historical society, April 11 and 12, 1918. Of the two dozen or more papers read, the following were devoted particularly to Wisconsin history: "Additional Wisconsin peace medals," by Charles E. Brown; "The state collection of war posters," by Ruth O. Roberts; "The work of the

Wisconsin war history commission," by John W. Oliver. The other papers were devoted chiefly to archeological and scientific subjects.

On September 2, 1918, an historical pilgrimage to the site of Fort Winnebago was conducted under the joint auspices of the state historical society, the archeological society, and the Sauk county historical society. Aside from the tour over the fort site and to other places of interest in the vicinity, the principal event of the day was the address of the Reverend William Dawson on "The historical significance of the portage."

An attractively-printed program of the Sauk county historical society records a noteworthy list of activities for 1917-1918, the organization's thirteenth year. The annual meeting occurred October 5, 1917, the principal address being given by M. M. Quaife on "The angel of Wisconsin." On March 1, 1918, a second meeting was held at which papers or addresses were given on the following subjects: "The coming of the circuit rider in Wisconsin," by W. R. Irish; "The first murder trial in Baraboo," by R. T. Warner; "The first permanent settler at Baraboo," by Louise P. Kellogg; "Pioneer occupations," by N. G. Abbott, of Eureka Springs, Arkansas. The program for the meeting appointed for April 5 consisted of the following papers: "When I 'broke into' Sauk county politics," by John M. True; "Wisconsin map by I. A. Lapham," by H. E. French; "Additional reminiscences of Abelman — a sequel," by Eva Alexander; and "Indians at Baraboo in pioneer times," by M. H. Mould.

The twelfth annual meeting of the Waukesha county historical society was held May 4, 1918. The program was given over to papers on the civil war: "The work of Waukesha county women during the civil war," by Mrs. W. H. Tichenor; and recollections of "Civil war times in Summit," by Mrs. Louise Williams. At the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Waukesha county society, held at Pewaukee September 7, 1918, the two principal papers on the program were: "Boyhood memories of the civil war period," by H. M. Youmans and "Early days in Pewaukee," by Mrs. Ola Anderson. The Green Bay historical society and the Manitowoc county historical society continue active work with scheduled meetings, the most important of which usually

fall in the month of March. On March 26, 1918, the former society listened to a program including papers on "Roads of Wisconsin and how they may be made more interesting," by W. M. Conway; "Shantytown in 1820," by Mrs. W. D. Cooke; and "The site of the first church built in Shantytown by Father Mazzuchelli," by J. P. Shumacher. The Manitowoc society was addressed on March 8, 1918, by Dr. A. Gerend on "The Indians of Manitowoc county." At the twenty-fourth meeting in Pewaukee, September 7, 1918, the program included: "Boyhood memories of the civil war period," by H. M. Youmans and "Early days in Pewaukee," by Mrs. Ola Anderson.

Periodical Literature

All the new ventures in the field of historical periodical publication launched within the last two years seem to have survived the uncertainties of tempestous war times. Equally important is the fact that they have on the whole been able to maintain the high standards which they set for themselves in the initial numbers.

The *Wisconsin magazine of history* has issued four numbers within the year. Besides a mass of special articles, historical fragments, and notes too numerous to be detailed, a number of formal papers have been printed in the magazine; these include: "Colonel Elmer E. Ellsworth: first hero of the civil war," by Charles A. Ingraham; "The Paul Revere print of the Boston massacre," and "The Bennett law in Wisconsin," by Louise P. Kellogg; "My recollections of civil war days," by Mrs. Lathrop E. Smith; "Alfred Brunson, pioneer of Wisconsin Methodism," by Ella C. Brunson; "The finger of God is there," an autobiographical account of the great forest fire of October, 1871, by P. Pernin; "The story of Wisconsin, 1634-1848," by Louise P. Kellogg; "Moses Ordway, pioneer Presbyterian missionary," by Thomas S. Johnson; and "The early history of Lafayette county," by P. H. Conley. The *Wisconsin archeologist* has brought out a few papers of interest to the local historian, including one on "Marinette county," by George R. Fox and H. O. Younger.

The *Michigan history magazine* continues along the lines mapped out in the first volume. In the quarterly issues since

July, 1918, the following articles have appeared: "What can a historical society do now?" by Augustus C. Carton; "France in the great war," by R. Clyde Ford; "The history of Memory Day," by John T. Daniells; "Father Jones and the Jesuit archives," by Fred Landon; "Harry Coleman," by H. H. Fitzgerald; "Indian place names in the upper peninsula and their interpretation," by William Gagnieur; "History of schools in Portage township, in the copper country," by Florence E. Paton; "Party organization in Michigan," by William H. Hathaway; "The University of Michigan in the war," by Robert M. Wenley; "Why the United States is at war," by Mahlon H. Buell; "Why the United States is at war," by Etta Kinch; "King Alcohol; his rise, reign and fall in Michigan," by John Fitzgibbon; "Claude Jean Allouez, S. J. (1616-1689)," by John A. Lemmer; "Work of the war preparedness board," by Roy C. Vanderhook; "Democracy's educational problem," by Claude H. Van Tyne; "America and the great war," by Bernice Anna Perry; "America and the great war," by E. W. Tiegs; "Our soldiers past and present," by Earl Brown; "The story of Grosse Ile," by John R. Command; "Mrs. Nellie G. Ferris," by Woodbridge N. Ferris; "A sketch of the life of Captain Wesley C. Brown," by Crockett McElroy; "The Council pine," by Charles E. Belknap; "Legislation by governor and judges," by William L. Jenks; "Borgess hospital at Kalamazoo," by Frank A. O'Brien; "The Central Michigan normal school at Mt. Pleasant," by Claude S. Larzelere; "Dan H. Ball: the pioneer lawyer of Marquette, the Nestor of the Michigan bar, a review of his life," by George W. Bates; "America and the great war," by Edwin J. Draper; and "America and the great war," by Dorotha McBride.

Four numbers of the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* have appeared during the past year carrying it down to April, 1918. The following papers are included: "A celebrated Illinois case that made history," by Stephen A. Day; "Thomas Beard, the pioneer and founder of Beardstown, Illinois," by P. C. Croll; "Thomas Lippincott, a pioneer of 1818 and his diary," by Charles H. Rammelkamp; "The great Cahokia mound," by John F. Snyder; "Colonel Isaac White," by William R. Sandham; "The Illinois centennial celebration," by Jessie Palmer

Weber; "De Linctot, guardian of the frontier," by George A. Brennan; "Historical notes on Lawrence county, Illinois," by Mary Tracy White; "Early history of Pleasant Hill, McLean county, Illinois," by D. C. Trimmer; "Reminiscences of Lake Forest academy," by George Manierre; "The Oregon trail," by Jonathan T. Dorris; "A momentous incident in the history of Illinois," by Jane Martin Johns; "The treaty of Greenville, 1795," by Charles A. Kent; "Pioneer days — a sketch of Major Richard Rue Cox," by Charles E. Cox; "History of Harmon township, Lee county, Illinois," by John L. Porter; "Samuel McAnulty, a pioneer of Adams county," by W. O. Farlow; "Illinois in the democratic movement of the century," by Allen Johnson; "Historical sketch of Wabash county, Illinois," by B. A. Harvey; "The Illinois centennial," by Edward F. Dunne; "An old Mormon town, Nauvoo, Illinois," by Nancy D. Clark; "The old Chicago trail," by A. Van Dyke Pierson; and "Kannekuk or Kuanakuk, the Kickapoo prophet," by Milo Custer.

The *Illinois Catholic historical review* has completed the four numbers of its initial volume, continuing the excellent plan laid down in the first issue. The following papers have been published during the year: "Illinois centennial celebration," by Frederick L. Happel; "Catholic women of Illinois," by Margaret Madden; "Catholic heroes of Illinois," by James M. Graham; "The Lazarists of Illinois," by Charles L. Souvay; "The church in Illinois in the transition period," by Joseph J. Thompson; "Father De La Valiniere, 'rebel' and Illinois missionary," by J. B. Culemans; "The first convent in Chicago," by Helen Troesch; "The commons of Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Prairie du Rocher," by Frederick Beuckman; "Old Kaskaskia ways and days," by Stuart Brown; "The development of the church," by J. J. Thompson; "The beginnings of Holy Family parish, Chicago," by Gilbert J. Garraghan; "The old church at Cahokia," by Robert Hynes; "William J. Onahan," by John Cavanaugh; "Illinois' first citizen — Pierre Gibault," by J. J. Thompson; "The first American men in this country," by Laurence J. Kenny; and "Archbishop Eccleston and the Visitandines at Kaskaskia," by John Rothensteiner. The leading article in the *Catholic historical review* for July, 1918, is by J. B. Culemans on "Catholic explorers and pioneers of Illinois."

The rich Catholic historical resources of the middle west have tempted a new historical quarterly to enter the field. The *St. Louis Catholic historical review* made its appearance in October, 1918, under the auspices of the Catholic historical society of St. Louis and under the editorship of Charles L. Souvay. The new review has published the following papers: "The Catholic historical society of St. Louis, the result of a century's endeavor," by John Rothensteiner; "The historical archives of the archdiocese of St. Louis," by F. G. Holweck; "The centenary of the foundation of St. Louis diocesan seminary," by Martin J. O'Malley.

The *Indiana magazine of history* continues to maintain its high standard in the series of articles published the last year, a standard which no other state historical publication in the old northwest has been able to excel. Noteworthy articles are: "Some reminiscences of James Whitcomb Riley," by George S. Cottman; "A historical sketch of Tell City," by Will Maurer; "Diary of the Mexican war," by Thomas Bailey; "Lincoln in Indiana" (concluded), by J. Edward Murr; "Secret political societies in the north during the civil war," by Mayo Fesler; "General Joseph Bartholemew," by George Pence; "Warrick county prior to 1818," by Arvil S. Barr; "The populist party in Indiana," by Ernest D. Stewart; "Edward A. Hannegan," by John Wesley Whicker; "Forerunners of Indiana art," by George S. Cottman; "The old Chicago trail and the old Chicago road," by Elmore Barce; and "Militia of the United States from 1846 to 1860," by Paul T. Smith.

The *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* devotes its [April and] July, 1918, numbers to a monograph on "The Indian in Ohio," by H. C. Shetrone. The October number presents the proceedings of the thirty-third annual meeting of the society at Columbus, September 25, 1918. The January and April, 1919, numbers contain the following papers: "Joshua Reed Giddings," by Byron E. Long; "The tory proprietors of Kentucky lands," by Wilbur H. Siebert; "Charles Dickens in Ohio in 1842," by Henson L. Peeke; "Ohio's German-language press and the war," by Carl Wittke; "The state library and its founder," by Daniel J. Ryan; "Samuel Portland Chase," by Arthur Meier Schlesinger; "The Ulrich group of mounds," by Truman B.

Mills; "Some notes on Ohio historiography," by Clarence E. Carter; "Address at Marietta, Ohio, 1858, by Thomas Ewing"; "Ohio's religious organizations and the war," by Martha L. Edwards; and a series of items on "Ohio battle flags." The *Catholic historical review* for January has an article on "The Gallipolis colony (1790)," by Laurence J. Kenny; "A history of the University of Buffalo," by Julian Park; "Roswell Park, a memoir," by Charles G. Stockton; "The woman's educational and industrial union of Buffalo," by Mrs. Frederick J. Shepard; "Historical sketch of Niagara ship canal projects," by Henry W. Hill; "Evolution of the New York canal system," by George Clinton; and "Our Tuscarora neighbors," by Frank H. Severance, are some of the contributions to volume XXII of the Buffalo historical society *Publications*. "The role of Niagara Falls in history," is discussed by C. O. Sauer in the February, 1919, issue of the *Historical outlook*.

The *Western Pennsylvania historical magazine* has continued its issues with papers as follows: "Economy — a unique community," by Mrs. Agnes M. Hays Gromly; "Fragments of University of Pittsburg alumni history," by George M. P. Baird; "A history of Allegheny," by Charles W. Dahlinger; "Frontier policy of Pennsylvania," by George A. Cribbs; and "Pennsylvania canals," by James Macfarlane.

A number of articles pertaining to the old northwest have appeared in the general historical periodicals and in the publications that hail from outside this region. In the MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW the following papers have appeared: "The literary spirit among the early Ohio valley settlers," by Logan Esarey; "The first railroad between the Mississippi and Lake Superior," by Lester B. Shippee; "The passing of the frontier," by Arthur C. Cole; and "Commercial intercourse with the confederacy in the Mississippi valley," by E. Merton Coulter.

The *American economic review* for March, 1919, contains an article on "Tenancy in an ideal system of landownership," by Richard T. Ely and Charles J. Galpin, which draws in the main on problems which find their more typical expressions in the middle west. In the July, 1918, *Missouri historical review* is an account by R. S. Cotterill of the national railroad convention in St. Louis in 1849. Part IX, *Transactions of the London and Mid-*

dlesex historical society of London, Ontario, contains an interesting account of the Wilberforce refugee colony in Middlesex county, composed almost entirely of colored refugees who crossed the Ohio and Indiana borders before the civil war. The article is by Fred Landon, public librarian of London. The *Journal of negro history* for January, 1919, prints another article by Mr. Landon in the same field entitled, "The antislavery society of Canada." An article on "President Lincoln and his war-time critics," by Arthur C. Cole, may be found in the *History teacher's magazine* for May, 1918.

Monographs and General Treatises

The grim demands of a world war had their effect in the main upon the publication of historical monographs of a serious character and upon the plans of those who aspired to qualify for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the field of American history. As a result few new ventures are to be announced for the current year.

Several general works should be listed as containing material of value for various phases of the history of the middle west. At least three volumes of the Chronicles of America series, edited by Allen Johnson, have subject matter of peculiar interest to students of the old northwest; these are *The old northwest*, by Frederic A. Ogg (New Haven, 1919. 220 p.); *Crusaders of New France*, by W. B. Munro (New Haven, 1918. 246 p.); and *The conquest of New France*, by George M. Wrong (New Haven, 1918. 246 p.).[5] A work entitled *Histoire de la fondation de la Nouvelle Orleans, 1717-1722*, by the Baron Mare de Villiers (Paris, 1918. xvi, 130 p.), throws some light on the trade of the Illinois country. *Our debt to the red men*, by Louise Seymour Houghton (Boston, 1918. 210 p.), is an estimate of Indian character based chiefly on the tribes to the east of the Mississippi. *The American Indian*, an introduction to the anthropology of the new world, by Clark Wissler (New York, 1917. 434 p.)[6] parallels part of this ground. *The valley of democracy*, by Meredith Nicholson (New York, 1918. 284 p.), is made up of a series of

[5] These three volumes are to be reviewed later.

[6] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 352.

articles attempting to deal in a critical way with the life of the people of the Mississippi valley. *A century of negro migration*, by Carter G. Woodson (Washington, 1918. 221 p.),[7] covers the exodus of negroes from the south into the states of the central west. The report of the United States department of labor on *Negro migration in 1916-17* (Washington, 1919. 158 p.) includes a report on "The negro emigrant in the north," by Francis D. Tyson. A careful and valuable study of *The movement for peace without a victory during the civil war* has been made by Elbert J. Benton and published as publication number 99 of the *Collections of the Western Reserve historical society* (Cleveland, 1919. 80 p.); it deals largely with conditions in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Another work entitled "Secret political societies in the north during the civil war," by Mayo Fesler (*Indiana magazine of history*, September, 1918, 183-286 pp.), analyzes a problem in the same field and covering the same states. The Polish contribution to western American history is studied in *Historya Polika w Ameryce*, by Wencelaus Kruszka (13 vols. Milwaukee, 1918). A study of the development and results of state control over the assessment of property for taxation entitled *State tax commission*, by Harley L. Lutz (Cambridge, 1918. 673 p.),[8] gives a chapter to each of the four states in the old northwest which have such commissions: Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio. Two studies dealing with regions bordering on the old northwest cover ground of equal interest to the states under survey. These are a study of *George Caleb Bingham, the Missouri artist*, by Fern H. Rusk (Jefferson City, Mo., 1917. 135 p.),[9] and a *History of economic legislation in Iowa*, by Ivan L. Pollock (Iowa City, 1918. 386 p.),[10] which the author has regarded as a review of "the economic legislation of a typical State of the Middle West."

The last year has witnessed the appearance of two volumes of the *Centennial history of Illinois* with the other three still in press. Volume II is *The frontier state, 1818-1848*, by Theodore C. Pease (Springfield, 1918. 475 p.), and volume III is *The era of the civil war, 1848-1870*, by Arthur C. Cole (Springfield, 1919.

[7] To be reviewed later.
[8] Reviewed *ante*, 5:217.
[9] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 225.
[10] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 494.

499 p.).[11] Several new items of Lincolniana have made their appearance, though most of them do not present any remarkable contribution: *Lincoln, the politician*, by T. Aaron Levy (Boston, 1918. 236 p.)[12]; *The voice of Lincoln*, by R. M. Wanamaker (New York, 1918. 363 p.)[13]; *Lincoln in Illinois*, by Octavia Roberts (Boston, 1918. 119 p.)[14]; *Latest light on Abraham Lincoln and wartime memories*, by Erwin Chapman (New York, 1918. 570 p.)[15]; *Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters*, by Luther E. Robinson (Chicago, 1918. 342 p.)[16]; and *The book of Lincoln*, compiled by Mary Wright Davis (New York, 1919. 399 p.).[17] Particularly valuable as a southerner's interpretation is *Abraham Lincoln and the union*, written for the Chronicles of America series by Nathaniel W. Stephenson (New Haven, 1918. 272 p.).[18] A biographical volume on Lincoln has been prepared by H. Nelson Gay for his series entitled *Americani Illustri* designed to acquaint the Italian people with eminent Americans of the past. *Lincoln and the convention of 1860*, by Addison A. Proctor (Chicago, 1918. 29 p.), is an address delivered before the Chicago historical society by one of the Kansas delegates to the Chicago convention.

The States publishing society is preparing a work on *Illinois in the world war*; this venture is not to be confused with the official undertaking of the state of Illinois in the same field.

The second volume of *A history of Indiana*, by Logan Esarey (Bloomington, Ind., 1919. 1148 p.),[19] completes the excellent study which, beginning with the earliest discovery and exploration by the French, is carried down to the mobilization in 1917 for the war against Germany. The Indiana historical commission has issued a volume entitled *The centennial medal book* containing chapters on certain phases of Indiana history. The commission has in press a volume entitled *The Indiana centennial, 1916*, by Walter C. Woodward, formerly director of the commission; it

[11] These two volumes are reviewed in this number.
[12] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 482.
[13] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 483.
[14] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 369.
[15] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 348.
[16] To be reviewed later.
[17] To be reviewed later.
[18] To be reviewed later.
[19] Reviewed in this number.

is also planning to bring out a volume entitled *Indiana's gold star honor roll.* The Indiana historical society has brought out in volume VI of its *Publications* a study of "Early Indiana trails and surveys," prepared by George R. Wilson, who uses his technical knowledge as a surveyor in a synthesis that involves the use of the available sources on the subject. *Military life at Indiana university* is the title of a twenty-three page pamphlet by Ralph L. Rusk, published by the University of Indiana, which makes an historical survey of the subject in question. A *Special report concerning common school funds*, by Gilbert H. Hendren (Indianapolis, 1919. 89 p.), contains an historical account of the school funds of Indiana by George Pence, one of the state fund examiners. Other Indiana items are: *The making of a township, being an account of the early settlement and subsequent development of Fairmount township, Grant county, Indiana, 1829 to 1917*, edited by E. M. Baldwin (Fairmount, 1918. 503 p.); *Government in Indiana*, by C. V. Haworth, a supplement to *Advanced civics*, by S. E. Forman; *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual session of the department of Indiana Grand Army of the Republic*, held at Logansport, Indiana, June 5, 6, 7, 1918; *A brief history of Mooresville and vicinity*, by Almira H. Hadley (Mooresville, 1918. 24 p.); and *The life of John Worth Kern*, the Indiana democratic leader, by Claude G. Bowers (Indianapolis, 1918. xvi, 475 p.).

A monograph entitled *The Indians in Ohio*, by H. C. Shetrone, has appeared in a number of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly.* A *History of northwest Ohio*, by Nevin O. Winter (Toledo, 1918. 660 p.), and a *History of Cleveland and its environs*, by Elroy M. Avery (3 vols., Chicago, 1919), are significant additions in the field of Ohio history.

The domain of Wisconsin history has been enlarged by the addition of a monograph on *Old Fort Snelling, 1819-1858*, by Marcus L. Hansen (Iowa City, 1918); *Elling Eielsen og den Evangelisk-luthereske Kirche i Amerika*, the story of the work of the first preacher among the Norwegian immigrants in the west, by E. O. Mörstad; and a *History of Door county, Wisconsin, the county beautiful*, by Hjalmar R. Holand (2 vols., Chicago, 1917. 459, 480 p.). *Democratic ideals, sketch of Clara Bewick Colby*, by Olympia Brown (n. p., 1917), is a small volume

devoted to the career of a Wisconsin woman prominently identified with the cause of woman suffrage in America by a veteran co-worker in the same movement. A pamphlet has been issued describing Wisconsin's participation, through a commission of three appointed by the governor of the state, in the exposition held in Chicago in the summer of 1915 to commemorate the semicentennial of the emancipation of the negro.

The historical geography of Detroit, by Alman Ernest Parkins, has been published by the Michigan historical commission as volume III of the University series (Lansing, 1918); it constitutes a satisfactory history of Detroit with emphasis on the economic phase of its development. Volume IV of the series is a study of *Political parties in Michigan, 1835-1860: an historical study of political issues and political parties from the admission of the state to the civil war*, by Floyd B. Streeter (Lansing, 1918. xxxiii, 401 p.).[20] The commission has in press volume V of the University series, *The Michigan fur trade*, by Ida Amanda Johnson, and *The life and times of Stevens Thompson Mason, Michigan's boy governor*, by Lawton T. Hemans. The two volumes of *Historic Mackinac, giving account of the historical, picturesque and legenedary features of Mackinac county*, by Edwin O. Wood (2 vols., New York, 1918. 697, 773 p.),[21] appeared shortly before the death of the author in December, 1918. A booklet of eighty-six pages entitled "Old settlers of the Grand Traverse region" (Traverse City, 1918) has been compiled by S. E. Wait and W. S. Anderson.

Bibliography

The *Writings on American history* for 1916, by Grace G. Griffin, carries down through another year the general list of historical publications. The Library of congress has issued a *Check list of collections of personal papers in historical societies, university and public libraries, and other learned institutions in the United States* (Washington, 1918. 87 p.) that should be of value to serious students of western history. The *Handbook of manuscripts in the Library of congress* (Washington, 1918. 750 p.)[22]

[20] Reviewed in this number.

[21] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 364.

[22] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 351.

is a detailed index of the largest manuscript collection in this country including important materials on the history of the old northwest. The Virginia state library has issued part two of its *Bibliography of Virginia* containing the titles of the printed official documents of the commonwealth, 1776-1916 (Richmond, 1918. 1404 p.). *A contribution to the bibliography of agriculture in Virginia* (Richmond, 1918) provides a list of source and secondary material bearing on the history of agriculture in Virginia. "A report on the archives of the department of state, state capitol, Lansing" is printed in the *Michigan magazine of history* for July, 1918. "A report on the public archives" of Wisconsin by Theodore C. Blegen has been issued in *Bulletin of information* number 94 of the State historical society of Wisconsin (Madison, 1918. 115 p.); *A supplementary catalog of newspaper files in the Wisconsin historical library: listing the papers acquired during the years 1911-1917*, by L. J. Beecroft and Marguerite Jenison (Madison, 1918. 91 p.), contributes significantly to the annual bibliographical output. The Indiana historical commission has completed a carefully-prepared index of the *Vincennes Sun*, down to 1825, covering the files while the state capital was at Vincennes and Corydon.

The *Catholic historical review* reprints the *Catholic encyclopedia* diocesan bibliography in the numbers from July, 1918, to January, 1919. The list for the province of Cincinnati is especially extensive. The April, 1919, issue begins a "Guide to the biographical sources of the American hierarchy." The *Illinois Catholic historical review* for April, 1919, publishes a selected list of sources for Catholic history in Illinois. "The historical archives of the archdiocese of St. Louis," are discussed by F. G. Holweck in the *St. Louis Catholic historical review.*

Mention might well be made in such an article as this of the increasing output of historical articles prepared by students of local history for the daily newspapers; these are usually listed, however, in the state historical periodicals. Of somewhat greater significance than the usual run of such papers was the "Centennial history of Illinois," by Rollin L. Hartt, which appeared serially in the *Chicago Tribune* in November and December, 1918. Such historical writing does serve to bridge the gap between the specialist and the layman.

It is to be hoped that the experience of the nation in the great war, as reflected in historical activities in the old northwest, will have served the purpose of giving history a greater place in the reconstruction order.

Arthur C. Cole

University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Fragmentary Journal of William L. Sublette

William L. Sublette, the author of the fragmentary journal herewith published, belonged to that second generation of Missourians intimately associated with the fur trade of the far west. The contemporary of Jedediah S. Smith, David E. Jackson, Thomas Fitzpatrick, Louis Vasquez, and "Jim" Bridger, like them he served his apprenticeship under the energetic, ambitious, and adventurous William H. Ashley in his own and the century's early twenties. During what was presumably his second trip to the mountains, in 1826, Sublette with David E. Jackson and Jedediah S. Smith bought out Ashley's interest in the lucrative business and from that time to his retirement in 1842, three years before his death, was directly or indirectly interested in the fur trade. In the course of these years he made frequent trips to the mountains, but, unlike many of his companions, he kept no diary or journal of his travels. His knowledge of the mountains, however, and his prominence as a citizen, made him eagerly sought by explorers, emigrants, scientists — in short, by all who ventured into the uncharted plains and passes of the Rockies.

The American west was a sportsman's paradise and in the heyday of the fur trade not a few big-game hunters from abroad tried their luck and skill at the buffalo, mountain lions, elk, and antelope. Two of the most prominent of these were Britons, Sir William Drummond Stewart of Murthly, Scotland, and Sir George Gore, Baron Sligo, of Ireland. Sir William Stewart spent years enough in the west in the thirties to become thoroughly enamored of the country and of the wild, rugged, primitive life of its inhabitants. Sir George Gore, following in Stewart's steps some twenty years later, spent a twelvemonth in the upper Missouri country where he was fortunate enough to secure as a guide the renowned "Jim" Bridger, who knew the mountains more intimately and more accurately than any other

man of his time. It is interesting to observe that both these gentlemen entered the west from the United States and under the auspices of American fur trading concerns rather than with the Hudson's Bay company from Canada, which might seem the logical approach for Britons. One reason for this was undoubtedly the more liberal attitude of the United States government toward the introduction of whiskey, which was deemed essential both for argument with the aborigines and as succor for the hunters. The American regulations on this subject were, to be sure, reasonably strict but not sufficiently so to prevent Sir William Stewart's obtaining permission, before setting out on his expedition of 1843, "to take with him as much spiritous liquors as he may deem necessary for the use of himself and party."[1]

Sir William Drummond Stewart made his first trip to the Rocky mountains in 1834. In his company, part of the time, were the Oregon missionary, Jason Lee; two scientists, Thomas Nuttall of Harvard and J. K. Townsend, the ornithologist; the enterprising Nathaniel J. Wyeth, builder of Fort Hall, and the trapping company of Milton Sublette, brother of William L. Sublette, and member of the firm of Fitzpatrick, Sublette, and Bridger. It was thus that he came to know the brothers Sublette, for William went to the mountains this year and was present at Rendezvous on Ham's fork of Green river, in June. For the next ten years Stewart and William Sublette maintained a correspondence at first formal and perfunctory but in later years thoroughly intimate and personal. Five expeditions to the mountains on the part of Stewart, in succeeding years from 1834 to 1838 inclusive, increased the intimacy between the two and gave to the foreigner that love for the west and that longing to return that so many others since him have felt and so few have gratified. Early in the spring of 1839, Stewart returned to Scotland to look after his estates and from then till the fall of 1842, when he at last came back to revisit with William Sublette their old haunts, his correspondence is filled with plans and projects. At first he hoped to return in 1841, then the trip was postponed to 1842 and full preparations were made for an expedition in the spring of that year, even to the purchase of

[1] Sublette manuscripts, carton 12, in Missouri historical society library.

horses and mules. Again he was delayed, however, and it was not till late in 1842 that Sir William set foot once more in "the land of the free, the friendly and the brave" as he calls it in one of his letters. He wintered in New Orleans, coming up to St. Louis in April, 1843. From this point, with a splendid outfit and in company with William Sublette, he set out for the country of big game.

William Sublette, as indicated above, retired from active business in 1842, so that Sir William on his arrival found him a gentleman of means and leisure, in the prime of life and as anxious as himself to enjoy again the vigorous out-of-door life of the mountains. Apparently Sublette regarded this trip as a sort of *grand tour* and, as such, worthy of being recorded in detail. Accordingly he started a careful journal and cash account of the expedition; but, perhaps being unused to keeping a diary and to much writing of any sort (nearly all his business correspondence and accounts are in the hand of his St. Louis partner, Robert Campbell), he quit abruptly after a few weeks and just at the point where his journal promises to be most interesting and entertaining. The fragment, however, is not devoid of interest, first because of the prominence of its author and further because of the frequent references to people and events of historic significance. The month of May, 1843, was important in the history of the whole west. From Independence and Westport there set out in this month, besides Stewart and Sublette, Lieutenant Frémont on his second exploring expedition, a group of Roman Catholic missionaries bound for the Flatheads and the Pend d'Oreilles or Kalispel to prosecute the great work begun by Father De Smet, and most important of all, the first real multitude of emigrants (considerably larger than the group of 1842) to the Oregon country and the "western watters." All these, Frémont, the Jesuits, and the Oregon emigrants were going into the wilderness to carry American civilization and American political institutions and they were all indebted at one time or another on their way to the two sportsmen, Sir William Drummond Stewart and William L. Sublette.

Harrison C. Dale

The Journal

Monday May 1st 1843
Wm. L. Sublette Left for the Rocky Mountains[2] with 3 men, J. Cromwell,[3] J. Godair, Alexander Cheauvin and 2 Black boys of My Own, John, 14 years and Lige, 11 years Old With 4 Horsis & 9 Mules.

May 1st,	Expencis	2.50
2	Expencis	3.12½
	Breakfast	2.00
3	Expencis	3.00
	Breakfast at Mopins	2.25
	Feriage, Gasconade,[4] 25 cts. man & Horse, Loose 12½	2.37½
		15.25
	Over	
May 4th 1843,	Brot over	15.25
	Bill	2.50
	Breakfast	.62½
	Feriage at Osage[5]	2.37¼
	Dinner and Horses	2.75
	Feriage at Morrow[6]	1.31½
	arive at Jefferson City,[7] had	
Saurel Horse shod in front		.75
	had Sir D. W. Stewart[8] mule shoes	
remove in front as he took lame		.25

May 5 1843
Bought 8 mules of Gorden & Burch,[9] at Jefferson City a $40 Each $320.

[2] Sublette follows the main highway westward, the Boone's road, south of the Missouri river.

[3] John Cromwell.

[4] The Gasconade river rises in Wright county, Missouri, and takes its course in a northerly direction entering the Missouri at Gasconade, Gasconade county.

[5] The Osage river rises in Oklahoma and after a meandering course of some five hundred miles joins the Missouri fourteen miles below Jefferson City. It is four hundred yards wide at its mouth.

[6] Moreau creek, a small stream entering the Missouri eight miles below Jefferson City.

[7] In 1840 a town of 1,174 inhabitants. The naturalist Audubon had passed through Jefferson City six days before, traveling by boat. Maria R. Audubon, *Audubon and his journals. With zoological and other notes by Elliott Coues* (New York, 1897), 1: 458.

[8] Sir William Drummond Stewart on this, his sixth trip to the mountains, left St. Louis a few days after Sublette. Stewart to Sublette, Sublette manuscripts, carton 3.

[9] W. S. Burch, a cousin of William Sublette. The firm of Gorden and Burch

Paid for cordage	.75
Over	26.56¼
May 5 1843 remained at Jefferson City	
Expencis	5.25
May 6th Left Jefferson City	
Bill	5.37½
Breakfasted at the Monitor,[10] Bill	2.00
Toll Gate	1.75
May 7 Stoped at Boon Ville[11]	
Bill at Boon Ville	7.75
Expencis in Crossing River to	
Look for Horse for Lieutenant Greyham,	2.50
Ferrage at Lamine[12]	1.75
8th Bill at Arrow Rock[13]	2.25
Cash to Cromwell & Chouvin for	
Breakfast & Horses	1.50
	56.43¾
May 8 1843	56.43¾
Took Breakfast and Staid all	
night at Marshall[14] Saline County	
May 9 Expencis	5.75
Breakfast at Gilbreths	2.00
Bought 1 Mule of Gilbreth	
@ $50, One Do @ $60	
May 10 Mule shod in front at Lexington[15]	.75
My Bill at Lexington	1.00
Men & Horses in the Country	2.50
Breakfast at Renick[16]	2.25
	70.68¾
May 11, 1843	70.68¾
Pasturage	2.00

was dissolved this spring. W. S. and Isabella Burch to W. L. Sublette, April 23, 1843, Sublette manuscripts, carton 1.

[10] The Moniteau, a small stream entering the Missouri near the town of Marion.

[11] Boonville, six miles below the mouth of La Mine river and high up on the bluffs overlooking the Missouri, is the county seat of Cooper county. It was named for Daniel Boone.

[12] La Mine river.

[13] Arrow Rock, Saline county.

[14] The county seat of Saline county.

[15] The county seat of Lafayette county.

[16] Strother(?) Rennick's, twelve miles from Lexington.

May 12 Bill at Independence [17] at
Knowles [18] 12.00
pasturage 1.50
ferage 1.00

$87.18¾

One third to W. L. Sublette for
my expencis 29.

58.
One mule 100.
2 mules, 55 each 110.
One at 60 60.

$328.

Sir Wm. D. Stewart Draft, check
On Prince, Ward, & King, New York,
May 12 1843 ..... 328.

000.

Sir William D. Stewarts Draft On Prence,
Ward & King for Three Hundred and Twenty
Eight Dollars, Balance due W. L. Sublette.
Independence May 12 1843
feriage at Bigg Blue [19] .25
14 May Bill at Nolands [20] 4.00
Went to Forte Osage [21] and Back, Bill .75
15 May Bill at Independence 2.50
Do at Renicks 1.00
16 May Bill at Noland 2.25

[17] The county seat of Jackson county, and, together with Westport and later Kansas City, one of the triple termini of the Santa Fé and Oregon trails and consequently a prominent outfitting place. Independence is forty miles from Lexington. At this time there were two taverns in Independence, one kept by Leonard H. Rennick and the other by H. Smalwood Noland, successor to William Lawrence.

[18] Possibly referring to H. S. Noland. See note preceding.

[19] Big Blue Water, a creek entering the Missouri just above Independence.

[20] See note 18.

[21] Fort Osage, built in 1808-1809 near the present town of Sibley, on the south side of the Missouri and east of Independence, was abandoned in 1827 on the erection of Fort Leavenworth. The site of Fort Osage was owned in 1837 by Mr. A. Gamble, who laid out the town of Sibley. Alphonso Wetmore, *Gazeteer of the state of Missouri* (St. Louis, 1837), 98.

	Bill at Westport [22]	1.00
17	Bill at Independence	2.00
18	paid L. Renick [23]	4.00
19	paid Leonard,[24] freight on Goods	16.20
	Expences	2.50
	Expense at Col. Childes [25]	2.00
	Do 208 [?] Bacon @ 6c	6.25
	Sundry small articles	1.25
	Olde Harness of Waldo [26]	3.25
May 20th 1843		
	Repairing Solomon's [27] Rifle	5.25
	for Candles	.12½
	2 Collars @ 1.00	2.00
	2 Briches @ 1.00	2.00
	2 Belly Bands @ .50	1.00
	2 Black Band @ .75	1.50
	2 Lines @ .25	.50
	1 Rod of Iron for Spits	.25
	3 Trace chains	1.75
	Feriage	1.50
	Hire of Col Childes Waggon to hall to Independence	7.50

[22] Four miles west of Independence and, at this time, quite as important as the latter.

[23] Leonard Rennick. See note 17.

[24] Again referring to Leonard Rennick.

[25] Probably James Chiles, a member of the local democratic committee of 1844.

[26] Perhaps of the firm of Brown, Waldo, and company, general merchandisers and outfitters.

[27] Solomon Perry Sublette had an interest for a time in the fur business of his more prosperous brother, but being of an unsettled disposition, he drifted in the thirties into horse trading, making several trips into the south. During the winter and spring of 1842-1843, he was back in Missouri, acting as a collection agent for Sublette and Campbell. This work took him up the river as far as Independence a few weeks ahead of William Sublette. From this point he left for the mountains (See entry under date May 30). On his return from the mountains in the fall of 1843, he tried his hand at the fur trade again in the employ of Bent and St. Vrain, journeying to Taos, in New Mexico, and even to California and back. In December, 1846, he applied for the office of Indian agent to the Sauk and Foxes and, after a hurried trip to Santa Fé, under contract to carry the United States mail, he was appointed to this office. His commission was renewed in March, 1848. He met with financial difficulties as Indian agent and in May, 1848, left again for New Mexico. In the year 1848-1849 he was in Santa Fé and Chihuahua, returning to Westport in December, 1849, and thence to St. Louis. In May, 1848, he married his brother William's widow. He died in St. Louis in August, 1857. The present sketch is based largely on his correspondence in the Sublette manuscripts.

Salt for animals	.40
Cordage	.50
May 20th, Blacksmith Bill	8.00
Keggs for tar	.75
Tar 2 galons	1.25
Shoing Horse	.75
Bacon	1.25
Harness Buckles &c	5.12½
Butter	1.25
peper	.50
Coffee mele	1.00
Cordage	.75
One Mule	45.00
1 doz Bottles	.50
Horse Shoing	2.75
May 23 Bill at Independence	12.50
Rosonn	.50
Flower 78 lb [?]	100.
1 Bridle for Solomon	.75
Feriage	.25
May 24 1843	
Bill at Westporte	4.00
May 26/43	
Sold Lieut. Fremont[28] 3 mules @ $30 and 2 at $35	160.
draft on Robt Campbell.[29] Sent one by mail & One by Fogle.[30]	
May 27 1843 Leather and Sundries to	10.00

Left Westeporte On May 27th 1843 for the Rocky Mountains. Mad 15 miles & Encampt at Round grove[31] thuss miss Sir W. D. Stewarts trail

[28] Frémont had arrived in Kansas City May 17, nine days before, and remained until the thirty-first, when he resumed his journey to the mountains. See letter of Frémont to Colonel J. J. Abert, chief of the corps of topographical engineers, Washington, March 1, 1845, published in John C. Frémont, *Narrative of the exploring expedition to the Rocky mountains in the year 1842, and to Oregon and north California in the years 1843-'44* (Washington, 1845), 105. Frémont, on leaving Kansas City followed Sublette's route for four days, after that bearing to the south.

[29] Sublette's partner.

[30] Possibly the Vogel mentioned by Francis Parkman, *Oregon trail* (New York, 1901), 8. Vogel kept a small grocery and gin shop in Westport. Says Parkman, "As we passed this establishment, we saw Vogel's broad German face and knavish-looking eyes thrust from his door." This was in 1846.

[31] Sublette was following here the usual Santa-Fé-Oregon trail. Round Grove or Elm Grove was on the headwaters of Cedar creek, a southern tributary of the Kansas

whom I Was to g[o] on With as he had Borne more to the N. W. to avoid the Oregan and California Co of about One hundred waggons Emigrating to the Western Watters.[32]

May 28 passt Some 40 or 50 Santa-fee waggons siting out on there Spring Expedition. Left the Santafee Trace [33] and took Sublette's Old Trace [34] to the Mountains made about 25 miles.

29 Good deal Troubled with the Crossing of the Creeks as the road was much Cut up by Waggons. In company with one California Waggon & 5 Oregon waggons Came up. Made about 18 miles & Encampt near the Kansa or Caw River.[35]

May 29th Came to Cansas River after 8 miles, found some 40 waggons Crossing the Cansas River Bound for the Oregan Territory at the mouth of the Columbia. Crost the River in pappans Boat.[36] The Ore-

river. See Josiah Gregg, "Commerce of the prairies, or the journal of a Santa Fé trader, 1831-1839," printed in *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites (Cleveland, 1904-1907), 19: 193, n. 35. Frémont camped here four days later. Peter H. Burnett, *Recollections and opinions of an old pioneer*, published in New York in 1880 and partially reprinted in the *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 5: 67, describes the grove as consisting of only two trees, both elms, and a few dogwood bushes. The larger of the elms had had all its branches trimmed off for firewood. Burnett with a large company of Oregon emigrants camped here five days before Sublette. See also J. W. Nesmith, "Diary of the emigration of 1843," in *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 7: 330, and George Wilkes, *History of Oregon, geographical and political . . . embracing an analysis of the old Spanish claims, the British pretensions, the United States title. . . To which is added a journal of the events of the . . . emigrating expedition of 1843* (New York, 1845), 67.

[32] Sir William had probably gone up the Missouri from St. Louis by boat. At any rate his heavier freight had been sent up in this manner and put on shore near Chouteau's Landing, twelve miles above Independence. Audubon, *Audubon and his journals*, 1: 468. From Chouteau's Landing he would proceed westward, to the north of the Santa Fé trail, following probably the north bank of the Kansas river (see entry under date May 30). There were a number of emigrant parties to be avoided. A large body had camped at Round Grove five days before Sublette, as noted above, and two other companies camped there on the thirty-first. Sublette probably refers to the earlier one, the famous Burnett-Applegate expedition, consisting at this time of 111 wagons. *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 7: 331. When the company reached a point about two hundred and fifty miles above Independence, thanks to a number of accretions, it comprised 992 souls, with 121 wagons, 698 oxen, and many loose cattle. Letter to the *New Orleans Picayune*, July 14, 1843, reprinted in *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 2: 190.

[33] The parting of the ways was just beyond Round Grove.

[34] The route of Sublette's fur-trading expeditions in the twenties and thirties and at this time substantially the Oregon trail.

[35] Not far from the present city of Topeka.

[36] Papin, a former French *engagé* who lived on the banks of the Kansas in a one-roomed log hut, cultivated a small plot of ground, and maintained a primitive ferry in the shape of a large raft. The Oregon company, which arrived at the crossing

gon people had a boat of their own. Made 3 miles and Encampd on the Soldier River which Emptis in the Kansas below.[37] Found there Encampt about One hundred and 40 Waggons for the Oregan or Columbia River.

May 30th 1843.

Started my 2 carts on a head to a creek 8 miles distance to Encamp Called Muddy [38] & I returned to gow down the River to meet Sir William Drummond Stewarts party who had left the united States Some 4 or 5 days before I did but had followed the Cansas up Over a bad Road for muddy Creeks etc. etc. Met Sir W. D. Stewart on the Banks of the Soldier and assisted them in Crossing here. I took charge of the party of Some 60 men. Sir William had 10 Carts & one small 2 mule yankee waggon.

There was Some 30 other Carts and small 2 horse wagons in Company Belonging to Individual gentlemen, Some of the armey, Some professional Gentlemen, Come on the trip for pleasure, Some for Health, etc. etc. So we had doctors, Lawyers, botanists, Bugg Ketchers, Hunters and men of nearly all professions, etc. etc.[39] One half or rather more was hired men Belonging to Sir William, which he had employed on the trip. In the Evening we arrived at Muddy Creek where my brother Solomon P. Sublette with 2 Carts and 2 priests or Missionaries with 3 Carts, 1 waggon, and one Small Cariole Joined us with some 15 or 20 men more and animals in proportion.[40] The priests or Jesuites was bound for the flatte head missionary which Was Established there by Father P. Desmit some 4 or 5 years Since. Father Demit Started this from St. Louis and he returned to Europe Intending to Come by Sea to the mouth of the Columbia & then on up the River to the Kettle falls where there Establishment is.[41]

the twenty-sixth, found his rates so exorbitant that they built a raft of their own on which most of them crossed, though not without disaster. See Wilkes, *History of Oregon*, part 2, appendix, 72.

[37] Soldier creek, also called Black Warrior creek, entering the Kansas just below Topeka. For a map of this region see the chart accompanying Frémont's report. The great Oregon company reached the Kansas three days earlier and spent five days, that is, until the thirty-first, in crossing and reorganizing on the other side. *Ibid.*, 73; *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 5: 68, 7: 330. The Kansas river at this point was about a quarter of a mile wide with sandy banks and bottom.

[38] Still called Muddy creek. It is one of the northern tributaries of the Kansas.

[39] All told, there were about one hundred men. Communication in the *Missouri Republican*, July 22, 1843, reprinted in *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 4: 402.

[40] This party had followed the Oregon trail, reaching the Kansas this day (May 30), and had crossed on the Oregon company's raft. Wilkes, *History of Oregon*, 73.

[41] Father De Smet, the famous Belgian missionary to the Flatheads, had first penetrated to the Indian country in 1840, preaching to the Flatheads, Shoshoni, and

To-day the Oragan people was perading and Electing there officers.[42] There was in company some 6 or 8 wagons.[43]

May 30 1843

Bound for the California or Spanish Country On the Pacific Ocean, we Encampd On Muddy and had trouble in Crossing falling trees to Cross Our Baggage Over On by the men & pulling Our Carts &c Over by men and mules as the creek was rather high. Here was a muddy and Wet time with all hands. The Oregan people did not come up.[44]

May 30 [45]

Move On with 18 carts, one 6 mule waggon, & 2 2 mule waggons & a smal Barouche, Some Cows, and Oxen, Some 80 men and about 20 or 25

Pend d'Oreilles or Kalispel, returning to St. Louis in December of that year. In 1841 he journeyed again to the mountains, founding St. Mary's mission among the Flatheads on the Bitter Root river. He spent the winter of 1841-1842 in the Oregon country, proselyting among the Coeur d'Alenes and journeying in the winter to Fort Colville, the Hudson's Bay company's post on the Columbia, and, in the spring, to Fort Vancouver on the lower Columbia. Again he returned to St. Louis and in the spring of 1843 accompanied Father De Vos, who had been made vice-superior of the mission, Father Adrian Hoeken, and Brother J. B. McGean as far as Westport, arriving there early in May. Returning to St. Louis, he proceeded to Europe, where he spent the remainder of the year gathering recruits for his work. He sailed from Antwerp December 12, 1843, reaching the mouth of the Columbia by sea July 28, 1844. St. Mary's mission is nearly two hundred miles from the Kettle falls. Edwin V. O'Hara, "De Smet in the Oregon country," in *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 10: 241 ff. See also Burnett, "Recollections and opinions of an old pioneer," *ibid.*, 5: 68, and H. W. Chittenden and A. T. Richardson, *Life, letters and travels of Father Pierre-Jean de Smet* (New York, 1904), 44.

[42] The final organization of the Oregon emigrants took place after crossing the Kansas. The method of election is vividly, perhaps over-vividly, described by a correspondent of the *New Orleans Picayune*, under date November 21, 1843, reprinted in the *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 1: 399. "The candidates stood up in a row behind their constituents and at a given signal, they wheeled about and marched off, while the whole mass broke after them 'lick-a-ty-split,' each man forming in behind his favorite, so that every candidate flourished a sort of tail of his own and the man with the longest tail was elected. These proceedings were continued until a captain and a council of three were elected." A literal running for office! Wilkes, *History of Oregon*, and Burnett, "Recollections and opinions of an old pioneer," in *Oregon historical society quarterly*, 5: 58 ff., places the election on June 1. Cf. Dale, "Organization of the Oregon emigrating companies," *ibid.*, v. 16.

[43] That is, with the Sublette-Stewart party.

[44] This may refer to a smaller party of Oregon emigrants (independent of the Burnett-Applegate company) which included Overton Johnson and William H. Winter, who later wrote an account of their trip: *Route across the Rocky mountains, with a description of Oregon and California, their geographical features, their resources, soil, climate, productions, &c.* (Lafayette, Ind., 1846). They were just a day behind Sublette and Stewart and had resolved to follow closely after them.

[45] *Sic* for May 31.

miles & encampt. Considerable difficulty with Small Greeks and Branches to-day.[46]

May [47] 1st & 2, 1843. Move on. Priests Waggon upset. May 3 Cart up-set and Broak shaft on Crossing a Branch of Bigg Virmillion,[48] hard days march. Rained in the Evening, had Wet Encampment.

May [49] 4, 5, 6, move on Crossing strems [50] with mudy Banks, havin all to work. The priests waggon & carts Stalling frequently. Met John Rishan [?] this Evening (June 6 1843) one of the party of the Company of Sabille and Adams [51] who has a fort on the River Platte near the mouth of Larami's fork. He had some cows & 6 Buffalo Calves & one young Elk also 5 or 6 One (horse) Waggons Loaded with Robes.

7th Move on. Rained hard Last night, Late Starting, 2 of our men returned here with the waggons for the States.

8th rained nearly all day. Crossing Little Sandy [52] as it was swimming. Crost goods & baggage on trees.

9th remain nearly one whole day on Bigg Sandy.

June 10th finished crossing Sandy.[53]

[46] The tributaries of the Blue river, which in turn flows into the Kansas, near Manhattan.

[47] *Sic* for June.

[48] Big Vermilion itself was a stream about a hundred yards wide and barely fordable at this season of the year. It is a tributary of the Blue river, entering it near Frankfurt, Marshall county, Kansas.

[49] *Sic.*

[50] Branches of Blue river.

[51] Saville and Adams. Their fort was near Fort Laramie. One of the lower tributaries of the Laramie is called Sibylee creek. The firm name frequently occurs Sibyl and Adams. This concern had met with rather more than usual success the preceding year. See copy of a letter of Sublette to Stewart September 1, 1842, Sublette manuscripts, carton 1.

[52] Little Sandy, one of the Nebraska tributaries of Blue river, entering the latter near Powell, Jefferson county, Nebraska. The Big Sandy is another tributary of the Blue, a little farther west.

[53] This would bring them to a point about three hundred miles from Independence and four hundred and fifty miles from Fort Laramie. Here the journal ends abruptly. Sublette and Stewart pursued their journey to the mountains by the much-traveled North Platte and Sweetwater route, returning in the autumn, after a successful hunt, to St. Louis.

BOOK REVIEWS

History of early relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844. By Kenneth Scott Latourette. [Transactions of the Connecticut academy of arts and science, volume 22, pages 1-209] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1917. 209 p.)

This monograph was evidently written as a doctor's thesis at Yale university. It represents, therefore, the results of a careful study of a wide range of material, organized with scholarly accuracy and judgment. It should be welcomed as a sound contribution to our knowledge of an interesting phase of the history both of the United States and of China.

The first three chapters deal with the American trade with China between 1784 and 1838. They contain a large amount of detailed information about the origin and development of this profitable commerce. Here will be found facts and figures dealing with the trade in tea and silk, in furs and sandlewood, information about the early merchants and skippers and some of their famous voyages, about the part played by different American ports, and the conditions at Canton in the pre-treaty days; and on page 78 a valuable footnote sketches the history of the United States tariff on Chinese goods to 1844. The fourth chapter studies the beginnings of American missionary work in China. Here again will be found many interesting and hard-won facts. The first American missionaries arrived in 1830, although Americans had been much interested in the work of the pioneer British missionary, Robert Morrison, since 1807. In 1832 the *Chinese repository*, that mine of information, was first issued. A year later, S. Wells Williams, sinologue and diplomat, arrived, and in 1835 Dr. Peter Parker, the first medical missionary, entered upon his work. The last chapter covers the critical years of 1839-1844 which saw the opium controversy develop into a war between Great Britain and China, resulting in the epochal treaty of Nanking. The United States followed up the success of Great Britain, and Caleb Cushing negotiated the treaty of Shanghai in 1844. In this connection a usual error is repeated, namely that Cushing's treaty introduced the principle of extraterritoriality in China. The principle, in vague form, was found in the early Russian treaties, and was inserted in the general regulations, 1843, which supplemented the Nanking treaty. In fact, the grant of extraterritoriality was probably made during the negotiations in 1842. Cushing should be given credit, however, for drafting the clauses so carefully that his treaty was taken as a standard until the revision of 1858.

The value of this study lies in the amount of detailed information which is rendered available. The author has made few generalizations, but he has gathered the materials from which generalizations may be drawn. The special student will greatly appreciate the fifty-five pages of bibliography. In addition to printed works there is a considerable list of manuscript logs, journals and correspondence. Generally a few words of comment are appended, and in the case of rarer works the library where a copy was found is mentioned.

PAYSON J. TREAT

Mexico's dilemma. By Carl Ackerman. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1918. 281 p. $1.50 net)

Mr. Ackerman has demonstrated the futility of ephemeral books on Mexico. Primarily intended for a public not wholly surfeited with war dispatches, his chapters formed suitable articles for the popular weekly in which they first appeared but hardly justify a more permanent form. His revelations concerning German propaganda are overdrawn neither from the standpoint of official connivance at the capital nor bribery of labor leaders at Tampico and other industrial centers. Indeed, the author might go further in his charges of German intrigue and associate the famous "Article twenty-seven" of the present Mexican constitution with the machinations of the former ambassador, Von Eckhard. The author has not overemphasized the pro-German bias of the army officers in Mexico, many of whom were actually Germans, but to this factor he might have attributed more strongly certain Germanophile manifestations of Carranza. The fact that the United States was on the side of the allies, however, will explain many of these same manifestations.

The book will prove acceptable to some readers who shortly expect to see the American boundary pushed from the Rio Grande to the Panuco, or far enough below the last named river to include the oil fields. It is needless to add that such aggression would have a most unfortunate effect on our Pan-American relations. Fortunately its sponsors are few and their selfish interests, readily discernible, form the best antidote to their ill-considered views. The author's account of railroad conditions is true to form, despite subsequent official denial elsewhere. Travel in Mexico today is no mere holiday jaunt, although the chances favor the traveler. The illustrations, particularly the caricatures, are timely and for American readers will have more than momentary interest. The constitution of 1917, given in the appendix, translated by Mr. H. N. Branch, is in a more usable edition in the *Annals of the American academy of political and social science* for May, 1917. The book is of the snapshot type that has little permanent historical value.

I. J. Cox

Santo Domingo. A country with a future. By Otto Schoenrich. (Macmillan company, 1918. 395 p. $3.00)

The lack of books in English describing Santo Domingo assures the present volume a wide welcome. The sympathetic spirit of the author inspires a confidence that a careful perusal fully justifies. His historical chapters afford a convenient summary of a tangled narrative, whose main outlines are necessary to an understanding of the republic's past and its future. In connection with his historical sketch the author might more frequently have connected his narrative with other parts of Hispanic-America, with Louisiana during the Napoleonic intervention for instance, or with Mexico and South America during the wars of independence. If this part of his work is open to criticism it is because the author makes his account too thoroughly local. The antiquarian will peruse with interest the chapter on "The remains of Columbus," which leads up the conclusion that the sacred relics still rest in Santo Domingo, as the mighty admiral wished.

The greater part of the book is devoted to a general description of the republic's resources, productions and people, their social and political institutions, their commerce and exterior relations. Recent events receive fair attention with little criticism of American intervention, for the author frankly confesses his faith in a continued American protectorate. Numerous illustrations, an excellent map, and frequent statistical tables and lists of officials add to the usefulness of the book.

I. J. C.

Federal power: its growth and necessity. By Henry Litchfield West. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1918. 216 p. $1.50 net)

The author of this volume has long been a close student of public affairs and has contributed to periodicals many articles upon important questions in national government and politics. As might be inferred from the title of this volume, he presents, with admirable conciseness and lucidity of statement, a sympathetic survey of the gradual, and in recent years rapid, expansion of the powers of the national government. He traces in a few bold strokes the early attempts to form a union of the colonies; the circumstances which resulted in the formation of the present union; and the influence of John Marshall, of the civil war, of congressional legislation under the interstate commerce clause, and of the supreme court in the expansion of federal power. Likewise, the growth of the presidency as the "embodiment of federal power" is illustrated by numerous instances in which presidents have been able to shape national policies through their domination of the legislative branch of the government. Federal power as a party issue and, of course, the inevitable

expansion of federal authority in connection with the recent war also receive brief treatment.

The concluding chapter on "Federalism and the future" sounds a note or two of warning. "Beneficent as the exercise of Federal power has been, and with the certainty that it will be increased rather than diminished, we must, nevertheless, admit that unless we deal with it along new lines, it is fraught with evil. Present conditions point toward an oligarchy wherein a few men will have supreme power, and the transition from an oligarchy to an autocracy is all too brief. The problem is to preserve our democracy even under a centralized, Federalistic government. The first step is to curtail executive power" by depriving the president of the veto or by making it possible for congress to override a veto by a majority vote. The next step is to increase popular control over the executive branch of the government in a way similar to that provided by the parliamentary systems of England, France, and especially Canada. This parliamentary system can and should be approached through gradual stages, "without disrupting our Constitution," by more strongly emphasizing the principles of popular government. The writer, however, disclaims any desire to reduce the presidency to the perfunctory position of the French president, and admits that it is not feasible at this time to reproduce the English premiership. "We can, however, avoid the abuse and misuse of Federal power by government officials, which is not a distant menace, if the men appointed by the President to administer the great departments of government are made directly and instantly responsible to the representatives of the people. . . . If in the past some such plan . . . had been in force, the history of sundry legislative and official actions would have been less open to criticism that has been the case."

This little volume deserves wide reading by the general public, and teachers of courses in government will also find it well adapted for collateral class reading.

P. Orman Ray

History of suffrage in the United States. By Kirk Porter, Ph.D. (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1918. 260 p. $1.25 net)

In his thesis Mr. Porter has traced the forces working from 1776 to the present time to bring about an extension of the franchise. The first two of the nine chapters are introductory, emphasizing the changes in the period immediately before and after the revolution. By the last decade of the eighteenth century the religious and moral qualifications of the colonial era had disappeared and the property qualifications had been modified by residence or taxpaying requirements.

Chapters three to nine inclusive consider the question of suffrage for foreigners, free negroes, and women. Between 1815 and 1830 the influence of Jeffersonian democracy held property tests at bay. In the next decade the needs of the new west, the growth of cities, and the rise of an industrial class that owned no land added to the number of those who were opposed to the old restrictions. Dorr's rebellion in Rhode Island is characterized (p. 100) as "practically the last struggle that was necessary to break the hold of property qualifications for good." The tendency of the newer states to grant the franchise to immigrants and the opposition of older states to this policy is noted. The immigrant was wanted in the west and wanted so badly that great inducements were held out to attract him.

After the franchise had been demanded and secured by practically all the native white men in America, and many states seemed willing to grant it to aliens while they denied it to free negroes, the latest applicants for suffrage appeared — the women. The beginnings of the woman suffrage movement dates back to 1848 but the civil war diverted attention from it before it was much more than well organized. An interesting table showing the essential qualifications for suffrage in 1860 is given on page 148.

In chapters seven and eight, the ways in which the negro obtained the suffrage, the use he made of it, and how he lost it are carefully studied.

Chapter nine shows how the arguments used for and against the exclusiveness of property holders, of natives, of educated white persons, have been adapted to the new question of woman suffrage.

The book is not, nor does it claim to be, an exhaustive study of suffrage laws in any given time, or place, or period, but it may justly claim to be the first history of suffrage in the United States that traces in its broader aspect the development of the move toward universal suffrage. The debates in the various state conventions have been used to bring out the political ideals, arguments, theories, social conditions and economic circumstances that made the members of these various groups want the suffrage and think they had a right to it.

There is not separate bibliography. The references to sources used are given in the footnotes.

ELIZABETH CROWTHER

American problems of reconstruction. A national symposium on the economic and financial aspects. Edited by Elisha M. Friedman. With a foreword by Franklin K. Lane, secretary of the interior. (New York: E. P. Dutton and company, 1918. 471 p. $4.00 net)

Friedman's *American problems of reconstruction* is not a compilation of excerpts from books and magazine articles; it is instead the joint production of a group of specialists, each of whom has written a special contribution for this particular work. The editor states his conception of reconstruction as an "attempt to determine what new conditions resulting from the war confront us and what suitable adaptions may be made to meet them." He believes that the country should first direct its thought to its immediate problems. "While the long range problems may without danger be postponed in treatment, the immediate problems we can ill afford to neglect. These deal primarily with the transition out of a state of war and not with any general attempt to alter fundamental conditions of the national economic life." Nevertheless, the contributions of the various writers bring forward many facts of fundamental importance in our reconstruction problems of the next quarter century, and the book has its particular value in its contribution to the entire range of problems which we face.

Part I deals with the idea of reconstruction and the lessons which America may learn from the European experience. Part II, on "Efficiency in production," gives detailed attention to the utilization of our mineral reserves, the necessity of developing technical research, the reorganization of the labor phases of industrial management, the readjustment of our basic industries to our new international relations and the need of an intelligent governmental policy regulating labor conditions and large scale industries.

The third part is devoted to transportation, commerce, and finance. It is particularly featured by its analysis of the problems of distributing agricultural products, the development of our international shipping, and the present and future outlook in American international trade. One of the most interesting discussions in the entire work is the careful study of the free port as an instrument of world trade, by Edwin Clapp.

The fourth and final section of the book deals with monetary and fiscal problems. An especially interesting feature of this part is the discussion of national thrift by Frank A. Vanderlip. One of the fundamental problems in American thought is discussed by Frederick A. Cleveland in chapter XXIV, "Can democracy be efficient?" This chapter is a stimulating comparison of the economics of national efficiency as worked out in Germany, Great Britain, and France. The author states as our central national problem at this time this question: "Shall

we as a democracy insist on strong executive leadership? Shall we so organize that our Executive can effectively direct and use all the forces and reserves of the nation for common welfare ends — be they the ends of peace or of war?'' ''Can we and our Allies so far adapt and tune up our political machinery that we may demonstrate in actual competition with Prussian autocracy an efficiency that is adequate for self-protection and at the same time make it consistent with the aims and purposes of democracy?'' The author answers his question in the affirmative, and the reader can not afford to overlook his answer.

D. D. Lescohier

The county. The ''dark continent'' of American politics. By H. S. Gilbertson. (New York: National short ballot organization, 1917. 297 p.)

In this severe but just indictment of county government Mr. Gilbertson has unquestionably struck at the most vulnerable spot of what remains of inefficiency in American political life. He presents an array of convincing data to show the existence of a ''very real and very important problem.'' He not only states the problem but explains its origin and suggests the lines along which a satisfactory solution may be attempted. To furnish the requisite historical background the author sketches the development of colonial county types, the establishment of ''safe guards against tyranny'' by the extension of the elective principle, the inevitable loss of popular control and consequent debasement of the county by the spoils politician. The story is familiar enough to those who have interested themselves in the evolution of local political institutions. Its significance lies in the fact that the county remains unredeemed while the city has been making remarkable strides toward political regeneration.

The short ballot is the *sine qua non* of redemption. More definitely, however, the author suggests certain broad outlines of a program for revitalizing the county. He recommends the elimination of urban counties, greater centralization of state administration to relieve the county of work it can no longer perform efficiently, home rule with respect to internal organization, an elective council chosen as local experiences and needs dictate, a responsible executive resembling the city mayor or preferably manager, and the various financial reforms that have had so conspicuous a place in recent municipal betterment. There is a splendid bibliography. Constitutional and charter provisions for county home rule in California and the New York proposals of 1916 are included as appendices.

C. O. Gardner

Connecticut in transition, 1775-1818. By Richard J. Purcell, Ph.D. [Justin Winsor prize essay in American history, 1916] (Washington: American historical association, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford university press, 1918. 471 p. $1.50)

Students of New England affairs have long felt the need of detailed and thoughtful study into some aspects of its social history. Every New Englander knows that many a town in that section of the country is still under the control of a class composed primarily of citizens who are at once the business and professional leaders, the core of the church and the moving spirits in politics. That they usually conduct public affairs with propriety and efficiency does not invalidate the assertion that their control is well-nigh complete. The chief merit of Mr. Purcell's book is that he has made a suggestive excursion into this new field of investigation.

Mr. Purcell has divided his study into three phases: religious, economic, and political or constitutional, emphasizing in each phase the personal elements concerned and asserting their substantial identity.

It appears that in Connecticut the Congregational clergy were the main bulwark against the oncoming both of infidelity and of liberality in religion. Yale was distinctly Congregational. Yale and the Congregational clergy dominated the schoolmasters and the legal profession. Yale and the clergy were federalists in politics. The dissenter, finding no sympathy for his own views in the minds of the religious leaders of his vicinity, inevitably drifted into the opposition both in religion and politics. Naturally the clergy linked religious dissent with immorality and with factious politics, and condemned both as an attack on the foundations of the state as well as a revolt against the "standing order." As the Baptists, Methodists, and Episcopalians, together with the out-and-out unbelievers, grew in numbers and respectability, it became evident that their union would be a distinct menace to Congregational leadership in the state. Since Congregational leadership and federalist leadership were the same, revolt against the one was revolt against the other. Success could not come without reinforcement, however, for the number of dissenters, although increasing, was still small.

Discussion of the economic transition in Connecticut falls into two parts. There is an interesting account of the rise of manufactures in the state — cloth, flaxseed, oil, spirits, buttons, leather, guns, and others. As early as 1810 Danbury was the home of fifty-six hat shops. The account of the controlling forces in commerce and industry indicates their identity with the federalist-Congregationalist group. The "bank crowd" likewise was federalist and Congregationalist.

Mr. Purcell's description of the development of unrest in the political

and constitutional realm more closely resembles the account given by writers who have dealt with other states during this period. As is well known, the governmental change in Connecticut was less than in most other states. As in Virginia, one of the vital factors in preserving the position of the standing order was the tenure enjoyed by officeholders; for example, Hezekiah Wyllys, his son, and his grandson occupied the office of secretary of state from 1710 to 1810. Suffrage qualifications restricted voting to persons possessed of property, and since after 1801 no man could get on the voting list unless he had the written approval of the civil authorities and selectmen, the making of freemen was practically in the hands of federalist justices.

The grip of the federalist-Congregationalist group on the state was further preserved by the fact that emigration to the west came at precisely the time when political and religious unrest was on the increase. The effect was to weaken the opposition and entrench the conservatives, for the emigrants were the restless and discontented, who were most likely to side with the republicans in their dissent. Cases are mentioned where enough emigrants left a town in a body to perpetuate its town life in the new country.

In the main, the work deserves the highest commendation. A few rhetorical infelicities and typographical errors may be noticed: for example, "genuine, general aversion" (p. 13); "losses at sea by seizures" (p. 117); "professional" (p. 229); "effrontery" (p. 234). The length of the volume, 419 pages of text, seems extreme.

An error of more importance, which Mr. Purcell has doubtless slipped into unconsciously, is best indicated in the statement on page 299: "The only reasonable explanation of Federalism's continued success was the strength of its organization." Was not federalism's success due not only to careful organization, but to the strong character and ability of the federalists; to the fact that on the whole they contributed largely to the success and well-being of the state; that they were on the whole the able and educated people of the state and that in the main they were public-spirited citizens? That they were unprogressive, narrowly partisan, and not sufficiently democratic is to be deprecated and even condemned. Nevertheless, a carefully-balanced judgment must take account of the strength as well as the weakness of the "old order."

The author has otherwise uniformly restrained a natural and very proper sympathy with the movement of revolt. It is no easy matter to preserve historical judgment and restrain impatience at a party composed of "godly men, of sober, solid, and steady habits," including practically every Congregational minister, nearly every lawyer of repute, physicians, the Yale faculty, and leaders in business, who were

so wedded to former ways of doing things that they were unable to understand the needs and possibilities of the laboring element, the lower and lower-middle classes, the poor and the unorthodox.

A complete and well arranged bibliography and index close the volume.

CHARLES R. LINGLEY

Life and times of Stephen Girard: mariner and merchant. By John B. McMaster, professor of American history, University of Pennsylvania. In two volumes. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott company, 1918. 468, 481 p.)

For more than fifty years the agents of Stephen Girard of Philadelphia kept him informed as to the gossip of local affairs. Since they were widely scattered in European parts and in the West Indies, their reports covered the world of trade like a dragnet; and they wrote of wars, revolutions, and financial crises like other current recorders of great events. Rarely were they participants, rarely even witnesses. What they wrote Girard was doubtless often wrong, or at best half true. But it was from their letters, in the absence of modern cable news, that Girard drew his estimates and shaped his plans. And in a half century, so shrewdly did he analyze his sources, Stephen Girard evolved from the provincial mariner into the merchant of the world. After his death his executors accounted for an estate of nearly seven million dollars. And before the day arrived to turn his fortune over to his well-known benefactions, Girard had, nearly single-handed, saved the credit of the United States and given stability to the second bank.

Mr. McMaster, the "official" biographer of Girard, has pieced these volumes together out of the unbroken letter files belonging to the great banker. He has added little in the way of interpretation or analysis. It is not easy for the reader to understand the processes of the West Indies trade, or the neutral trade during the Napoleonic wars, although careful study of the sources that are printed may yield results. It is equally hard to reconstruct the financier. The man Girard is almost totally absent; the biographer appears to have had no option here, because there were few personal documents in the collection. The thing that stands out most clearly in the work is the series of anecdotes of happenings, without connection and without completeness. The diligent student of economic history may use these volumes as a source; but the biographer's reputation as a historian has not been enhanced by them.

F. L. PAXSON

The book of Philadelphia. By Robert Shackleton. (Philadelphia: Penn publishing company, 1918. 413 p. $3.00)

The book of Philadelphia is a title suggestive of a large task. Philadelphia is complex, old, still growing, and he who understands her and writes of his understanding so that others may share it must have energy, insight, and skill. Mr. Shackleton's book bears ample evidence of his powers as an interpreter; his previous efforts at baring the souls of New York and Boston have given him a penetrating vision and a sureness of touch that find full scope in his book of Philadelphia. He has given us far more than a guidebook for the tourist or casual sojourner; his observations and comments have a character that should make the book even more valuable to Philadelphians than to outsiders. Cities are not above having a mirror held up before them, and fortunate indeed is the one which is privileged to catch its reflection in pages of Mr. Shackleton's.

Very little escapes him. For those who see only with their eyes there is a wealth of vivid impressions; one senses the generally permeative color of the older portions of the city and delights in one picturesque bit after another; the narrow streets and the congestion around the city hall are portrayed most realistically by Mr. Shackleton's pen. And for those who seek more than visual impressions there is equal satisfaction: an echo of the voices of the newsboys, the love of the city for its opera, the tradition of the great business houses, the pride of lineage of the Philadelphians of Philadelphia. The richness of historical background of the city of Penn and Franklin flavors every page, but Mr. Shackleton has mercifully spared us the piling up of tedious antiquarian details which too many writers have thought necessary properly to impress their readers with Philadelphia's heritage from the past. One can not doubt that Mr. Shackleton is thoroughly familiar with a mass of such details, but he has had the artistry to give them to us only through his personal reactions to them, delightfully humanized and everywhere enlivened by his mellow sense of humor.

By one who would know Philadelphia this book can not be disregarded. It is therefore particularly to be regretted that it is not of more substantial workmanship; for the paper and binding will be by no means wholly satisfying to those who like to see their book friends well clothed. A number of excellent photographs add to the interest, however, and a few pen sketches, albeit rather characterless, serve to attract the eye. These shortcomings in externals are nevertheless slight in comparison to the merit of the contents; the book is well worthy of a permanent place upon the shelves of those who would know our American cities.

The royal government in Virginia, 1624-1775. By Percy Scott Flippin, Ph.D., associate professor of history in Hamilton college [Columbia university studies in political science, volume LXXXIV, number 1] (New York: Columbia university, 1919. 393 p.)

The colonial history of the United States is usually not very interesting, because it is the story of small things. In comparison with the great age of Europe, with which it was contemporeaneous, colonial America seems dull and humdrum; it is overshadowed by the magnificence of Louis XIV, the seven years' war, the imperial expansion of England in India. Yet in the long run, in the development of a new and non-feudal social and economic order, America has come to overshadow Europe and to give direction to the destinies of the world. For this reason the tale of our small beginnings has an importance altogether out of proportion to its immediate interest, for it is important to know what in our history is American, self-developed, original, non-European. The appearance of a valuable study on Virginia colonial history, such as Mr. Flippin's *The royal government in Virginia,* is, therefore, a matter of considerable concern.

There were three important factors in the early history of the Old Dominion: the governor, the council, and the house of burgesses. The governor was the actual representative of the British government in the colony and naturally wielded a great influence. The council, a body of colonials appointed by the crown, was partly under the governor's influence and partly independent. The house of burgesses, which was elected by the people, showed the most remarkable political development of all colonial America, rising from comparative insignificance in 1619 to become one of the greatest legislative bodies in history — in reality the prime actor in the resistance to the British government and in the measures that brought about the revolution.

Mr. Flippin has told the story of colonial Virginia with a wealth of detail and a clearness of presentation that make his book one of the leading studies in this field of American history. The chapter on the governor is particularly interesting; it gives a clear outline of the long struggle waged by the colonial governors to check the tendency toward greater self-government. The chapter on the council is also valuable, but the author did not make the most of his opportunity with the house of burgesses. Less space is given to the house than to the council, a disproportion which is doubtless due to the fact that much has been written on the burgesses and little on the council. Nevertheless, Mr. Flippin's knowledge of his subject is so rare and his mastery of his material so complete that a full presentation of the history of the house of burgesses, even at the risk of a partial repetition of other writers, would have been

exceedingly useful. The chapter on "Financial systems and administration," dug out from the records in the Virginia state library, is the most original contribution of the book, adding as it does a mass of detail to our previously somewhat sketchy knowledge on this subject. All in all, *The royal government in Virginia* is a work of value, scholarly, well-written, and authoritative. No student of early American history can afford to neglect it.

H. J. Eckenrode

The John P. Branch historical papers of Randolph-Macon college. Volume v, numbers 1 and 2. Edited by Charles H. Ambler. (Richmond, Virginia: Richmond press, 1918. 233 p. $1.00)

The present number of the Branch historical papers, which are among the best college publications of the country, contains the "Life of John Floyd," by Mr. Charles H. Ambler of Randolph-Macon college, and the "Diary of John Floyd." It is a contribution of some importance to American history.

John Floyd, once semi-famous, now entirely forgotten, served a number of terms in congress, where he rendered notable service by advocating the annexation of the Oregon territory in opposition to the "Little Americans," who would have been willing to see the republic permanently bounded by the Rocky mountains. Floyd later became governor of Virginia in the critical nullification period and was known as a state rights advocate of the most uncompromising type and the fast friend of John C. Calhoun. His son, John B. Floyd, was secretary of war in Buchanan's cabinet, a secession leader, and a general whose prestige was utterly ruined by Grant's capture of Fort Donelson.

Mr. Ambler's biography is an admirable study in the politics of the Jacksonian period; as such it is of decided value to students of history. It is well written, but it suffers from the rare defect of over-condensation, for the author has compacted in a hundred pages material enough for a volume. Floyd's diary is an interesting revelation of an ante bellum politician, though it adds only some details to our knowledge of the time. Mr. Ambler is among the foremost students of American history, having a vast and minute acquaintance with southern politics from 1815 to 1850. A larger volume by him — say a definitive biography of John C. Calhoun — would give him the national reputation he richly deserves.

H. J. E.

Highways and byways of Florida. By Clifton Johnson. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 264 p. $2.00)

A great deal has been said about "seeing America first," and Clifton Johnson has done a great deal in his "American highways and byways" series to make this pastime most interesting. His latest contribution to the tourists' library is *Highways and byways of Florida.* The book is made attractive by beautiful photographs, the print is comfortably large, and the style is interesting; in short, it is one of those books that we say just read themselves.

The author first gives an account of the settlement of Florida, making the early heroes, Ponce de Leon, Fernando de Soto, Ribaut, and Menendez, seem very real. He recreates before our eyes the treacherous savages, the cruel Spaniards, and the fanatical French so realistically as promptly to raise a desire to visit this land of mystery and legend and to witness the remains of the civilization which was established with such great difficulty in the beautiful "land of flowers."

San Marco's fortress, with its mysterious dungeons, St. Augustine's ancient landmarks, the picturesque natural charms of the St. Johns and the Ocklawaha river, and of the forest and swamps appeal to historian and nature lover alike, while for those seeking pleasure of a different kind the wonderful winter resorts of the state are described. Accurate information is also given in regard to the climate, products and industries of the state. No part of the state, apparently, is without interest, and anyone contemplating a trip to Florida will find this book not only entertaining, but instructive as well. To the reader who is denied the privilege of an actual visit the author furnishes a pleasant substitute for such a trip.

Esther M. Dole

The truth about lynching and the negro in the south. In which the author pleads that the south be made safe for the white race. By Winfield H. Collins, A. M., Ph.D. (New York: Neale publishing company, 1918. 163 p. $1.25 net)

Pessimistic rather than constructive is the tone of this little monograph. In the first chapter the author shows that there was relatively little lynching anywhere in the country prior to 1831, and that little was not confined to the south. From 1831 on, the lynchings increased, largely, the author believes, because of the antislavery movement. He holds that the abolitionist fanatics were more responsible for the crimes than the southern whites. During the civil war, Mr. Collins finds but two instances of negroes lynched in the south. With the coming of the carpetbag era, lynchings multiplied in frequency, spread over a wider area, and were prompted by a greater variety of pretexts. This is

mainly, (and rightly, the reviewer thinks) attributed to the demoralizing radical carpetbag régime (pp. 36-37).

A chapter bristling with statistics discusses lynching since the carpetbag era. Another deals with the criminality of the negro, which is considered racial rather than factitious, though the author thinks city life has a very demoralizing effect upon the negroes.

Segregation as an amelioration of the problem is urged in chapter v, and is reverted to in a later chapter, where it is urged for the rural as well as the urban districts, in order to "lessen friction, to check criminality and immorality, and to prevent the spread of disease" (p. 122).

The next chapter discusses the economic status of the negro at present. The author's conclusions are not sanguine, to say the least. In the seventh and last chapter, the future of the negro is considered. Education, as a solution, is rather discounted, especially the mere study of books. Apparently Mr. Collins thinks that disease and economic pressure will drive the negro to the wall, and unless he mends his ways, he is doomed to go the way of the Australian aborigines. If not exterminated, his numbers will be so depleted as to render his presence no longer a problem.

All in all, the book is disappointing; it discourages rather than stimulates more serious study of this great question. One of the few positive notes in the essay is the advocacy of a wider distribution of the negroes throughout the country, so that the problem will cease to be mainly a southern one. If there are fairly equal numbers of negroes in each state, they will be in a minority everywhere, they will present less of a problem, and legislation on the subject will be national rather than sectional or partisan, thinks Mr. Collins. Also, the negro could "the better be held to the white man's standard of conduct" (p. 143).

There are several examples of careless proof reading, such as *1809* for *1909* (p. 109) and *Lowdnes* for *Lowndes* (p. 157). The work is fully annotated, but has no index.

Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.

Official and statistical register of the state of Mississippi. By Dunbar Rowland, LL.D., director Mississippi department of archives and history. [Centennial edition] (Madison: Democrat printing company, 1917. 1023 p.)

The first issue of this publication appeared in 1908 and like the present bears on its title page the name of Mr. Rowland. A comparison of the two volumes shows that each successive issue is by no means a vain repetition of its predecessor. One notes that in the present publication the facsimiles of many valuable early maps are absent and also a lengthy and valuable sketch of Mississippi's military history down to 1898. On

the other hand there is much additional material of value dealing with the history of the state from the day of the Indian to the Mexican border disturbances of 1916. One may assume that the story of Mississippi in the present war is reserved for later treatment.

The volume is called the "Centennial edition" and for this reason appears a year later than usual. Its memorial character is emphasized in the colored plates showing the state flag and coat of arms, the state flower, the source of the state's wealth, the cotton plant, and in the words and music of the state song, written by Mrs. Rowland. The volume is profusely illustrated with photographs of former governors and other state and national officials. The usual list of present and former officials, national, state, and county, appear as in former volumes, but in the case of the judiciary these lists are accompanied by a valuable sketch of the state supreme court. In compilation, authorship, and in press work, the volume is worthy of its predecessors and abundantly justifies the happy idea of its editor in making an official register a work of real historical value.

Publications of the Mississippi historical society. Edited by Dunbar Rowland, LL.D., secretary. [Centenary series, volume II] (Jackson: Mississippi historical society, 1918. 604 p.)

Unless special care is taken, the bibliographer is likely to confuse the various publications issued by local and state historical societies. Those of Mississippi will prove no exception to this rule. A few years back the Mississippi historical society and the State department of archives and history were under separate control. Now they are under the same general direction and both series of publications bear the name of Mr. Dunbar Rowland on the title page. For many reasons this unity in publication is desirable, and the editor's name carries assurance to many who have come to know and appreciate his work. On the other hand the present volume bears the additional statement "Centenary series Vol. II" and without further explanation in the introduction or elsewhere one wonders if the annual volumes of the Mississippi historical society are to continue under that name, and what is to be the relation of future issues to the earlier publications of the society.

The "Introductory note" and the "Contents" suggest that the volume is of a miscellaneous popular character. A cursory examination confirms this impression. A centennial poem, a brief biographical sketch of a veteran of the war between the states, sketches of two military organizations of that period and of a minor skirmish constitute the incidental offerings. The editor and Judge J. P. Young discuss from opposing points of view the discovery of the Mississippi by De Soto, the former

championing Mississippi and the latter Tennessee. The greater part of the book is devoted to a study of reconstruction by Captain J. K. McNeiley, the editor of the *Vicksburg Herald.* It is unfortunate that this study has had to be presented piecemeal in the former publications of the society and in this volume, for in the present form the work must compare unfavorably with the more scholarly production of Mr. James W. Garner. A general index and an index of names add to the usefulness of the volume.

Political parties in Michigan, 1837-1860. An historical study of political issues and parties in Michigan from the admission of the state to the civil war. By Floyd Benjamin Streeter. [Michigan historical publications, University series IV] (Lansing: Michigan historical commission, 1918. 401 p.)

This work is another contribution to the field of political development within the commonwealths, a field as yet by no means overworked. Opening with a discussion of organization of the democratic and whig parties during the territorial period, the author shows political alignment as based on economic interests, locality, and influence of previous association. Particularly interesting is the description of the relative weight in Michigan politics of the various elements of the population wherein the New York contingent predominated with the New England contribution next in importance. It was, however, from the New England stock that most of the leaders of both parties sprang in the early days. Since the period of this study falls within the era when the controversy over slavery was uppermost, it is but natural that slavery in its many political manifestations should play a most potent part in the local arena.

Chapter II discusses the antislavery agitation with the emergence of the liberal party, which was composed almost entirely of New York and New England people who knew of the "peculiar institution" only by hearsay, and of the poorer people who had an innate aversion to non-free labor and the "social stratification" produced by a system of servitude. The same issue, in its connection with expansion, together with the tariff controversy, is next traced through the national campaigns of 1840 and 1844 (chapter III), and the disruptive tendencies, especially for the democrats, who fell into four rather distinct groups, are well brought out. The theme naturally brings forward in chronological order the Mexican war and the Wilmot proviso which still further rent the ranks of the whigs and democrats and brought about the organization of the free soil party. Here the analysis of the personnel of the two parties affords a basis for understanding why the conservative east-

ern group in each party should fall out with the radicals who were stronger in the western portion of the state. Incidentally Mr. Streeter's distinction between the "western" and the "frontier" element seems a bit too finely drawn.

Michigan, in common with the rest of the north, split over the compromise measures of 1850; the radical element of both old parties refused to accept these acts as a final solution of the slavery problem, and particularly objected to the "rendition law," as the author chooses to designate the act ordinarily referred to as the fugitive slave law. The conservative element of both whigs and democrats, however, secured control of the parties by 1851. The free soil group, which was strongest in 1848, showed a tendency to coalesce with radicals of both the old parties from 1849 to 1852, although certain of the radical democrats, preferring to go alone, attempted to organize a "free democratic" party which displayed considerable activity especially in 1852.

Chapter VIII treats of the break-up of the whigs and the organization of the know-nothing and republican parties, while chapters XI and XII carry on the story through the presidential and state campaigns of 1860. Since Michigan was one of the most important states in connection with the birth of the republican party, the detailed analysis of the situation which resulted in the gradual grouping of dissatisfied elements into a new political organization is most valuable. It appears, however, that somewhat too little importance is attached to the tenets carried over from the whigs, such as the tariff, internal improvements, and a homestead law, the latter, to be sure, peculiarly western in its significance. So, too, in the discussion of the campaign of 1860 altogether too slight attention is paid to the non-slavery planks of the republican platform and the part they played in Michigan.

In chapter VII there is an illuminating account of the "Foreign element in Michigan politics." But this chapter, and even more chapter IX on "The churches in Michigan politics" by going over again the same period covered by other portions of the book, needlessly confuse the reader and make unnecessary reduplication. The subject matter might well have been incorporated in the main narrative.

Of specific criticism in detail there is little to be made, although one might well question the author's grounds in his assertions regarding the primarily western attributes of political abolitionism. Equally well might one desire a more clear-cut distinction between the "Native American" movement of the thirties and forties and the American party, or know-nothings, of the fifties.

The illustrative maps are good. The bibliography is exhaustive and

critical. One feature of the book, a characteristic of this series by the way, is a thirty-page analytical outline of the work in place of the ordinary table of contents. Just what purpose this serves, unless it is intended to save one the trouble of reading the book, it is hard to grasp.

Taken as a whole the work contains a mass of interesting detail, painstakingly and often painfully documented; for example, one chapter of sixteen pages has seventy-five footnotes. It is this superabundance of detail which gives ground for the most serious criticism of the work: one becomes lost in it, and the interest of the reader tends to flag as he wades through it.

LESTER B. SHIPPEE

Public life of Zachariah Chandler, 1851-1875. By Wilmer C. Harris, Ph.D. [Michigan historical publications, University series XI] (Lansing: Michigan historical commission, 1917. 152 p.)

This work is of special interest to students of Michigan politics in the period centering about the civil war and the rise of the republican party. From 1851 to his death in 1879 Zachariah Chandler was prominent in public life, and Mr. Harris endeavors to set forth the main features of his public character and career.

While the author admits that the well-known *Post and Tribune* biography is a mine of information about Chandler's career, he finds it not wholly impartial. Indeed it could hardly be so, written by Chandler's friends at a time when the stirring events connected with his life were still fresh in their minds. To ardent admirers of Chandler, Mr. Harris' book may seem not to have escaped the opposite bias. Certainly the author is not eulogistic. He presents Mr. Chandler as "a typical product of his time, a fire-eater of the Northwest, the representative in the United States senate of the radical spirit dominant among his constituents during the epoch of Civil War and Reconstruction." He sees him also as a typical "boss." It may seem to Chandler's friends that Mr. Harris has drawn too extensively upon the *Detroit Free Press,* which in that day was notoriously "copperhead" under the vitriolic pen of Wilbur F. Story, no friend of Chandler; if there was any one thing that Mr. Chandler hated more than another, it was the man who could not be trusted to stand "four square" on the war and its issues, and Mr. Story and Mr. Chandler were therefore natural political enemies.

The task of Mr. Harris, while a difficult one, has been on the whole well performed. He has evidently taken as a guide neither the hostile columns of the *Detroit Free Press* nor the flattering pages of the older biography. He has made much of the *Congressional globe* and the *Congressional record,* and there is evidence of careful use of standard biog-

raphies, histories, encyclopedias and monographs. The almost hopeless task of finding original manuscript letters by Chandler he accomplished in a degree. Some he located in the Library of congress, the Burton historical collections in Detroit, and a few in Marshall, Michigan, and in Lansing. The newspapers and periodicals of the day he has used quite thoroughly, especially Michigan newspapers. This data he appears to have used with the scholar's care.

The fact that Chandler was a practical politician and the boss of the republican party in Michigan is too well attested to need to rest upon the testimony of a copperhead journal. The most bitter arraignments of Mr. Chandler for his domination of the party in Michigan were made by members of his own party. Today we can afford to view these facts in their historical perspective. Ours is a government by parties. War demands a centralization of power. The republican party which controlled the government during the civil war had to be autocratic, just as President Wilson's power has been autocratic as a necessary corollary of the world war. Mr. Harris shows that Chandler's dictatorship in the republican party in civil war days made for efficiency and the better mobilization of the resources of the state for the support of the administration of President Lincoln; that to maintain this position Chandler used the practical political methods of his time; that indeed he could not have done otherwise and saved his opportunity.

In the latter part of the volume the author points out the results of Chandler's continuing in control after the passing of the need for autocratic party domination and the kind of politics to which Chandler was accustomed. During the earlier part of Chandler's career his power rested on the fact that he represented the will of a majority of his constituents, and he fortified this control through the organization of a party machine of which he was "boss." As the older issues faded away he continued in control of his party, less through his perfect representation of a majority of his constituents, and more through his control of party machinery. "It is a law of politics," says Mr. Harris, "that men who enter public life full of patriotism and enthusiasm for some great moral issue, once that object is attained, are not likely to see that new issues have arisen and that new problems have come to demand solution. They go on along the old lines. It was so with Zachariah Chandler." Chandler never forgot that the southerners had been rebels, and he was by temperament and experience unfitted to be a leader of Michigan republicanism in reconstruction days. When he could no longer retain even his control over the "machine," he fell from power. But his work was done, and Mr. Harris shows that he had played his part well. Despite the surface impression which the book gives of an

unsympathetic writer, a careful reading will show the writer's admiration for Chandler for his service to the nation in an hour of great need.

The book contains numerous illustrations of Chandler at different times of life, and is supplied with a bibliography and a good index.

GEORGE N. FULLER

A history of Indiana from 1850 to the present. By Logan Esarey, Ph.D., assistant professor of western history, Indiana university. Volume II. (Indianapolis: B. F. Bowen and company, 1918. 1148 p.)

This second and final volume of Mr. Esarey's comprehensive history of Indiana is, like the first one, a valuable contribution to the history of the middle west. It includes all the varied phases of Hoosier development since 1850, and is evidently founded upon an exhaustive and adequate search of the available source material. Most of the topics included in the work are treated in great detail and in comprehensive fashion.

Among the topics included in this volume, perhaps none is more important than the political history of Indiana since 1850. As a pivotal state in which the great parties are usually very closely matched, Indiana has assumed much importance in national politics during the period under consideration, and the play of partisan struggle, especially in the civil war and the era of reconstruction, is set forth in interesting fashion. Moreover, by the attention paid to the national background, the narrative rises above the level of a mere account of local petty politics. Unfortunately, at times there is confusion of national and state issues, as on page 610 where the author mentions the "election of 1852" but leaves the reader to guess whether a national or a local election is being considered.

Especially interesting and important are the accounts of the attitude toward slavery, of the underground railroad, of the rise of the republican party in Indiana, of the mysterious Golden Circle, and of the grange movement. In fact practically all the important features of the political history of Indiana since 1850 have been treated at length, and with due emphasis, but it is regrettable that so little attention has been given to the call for a constitutional convention issued by the general assembly in 1917. In the first volume of his history Mr. Esarey devoted an entire chapter to the constitutional convention of 1850. A well-balanced narrative would demand an equally extended analysis of the movement that culminated in 1917 in the very determined though temporarily ineffectual effort to call another constitutional convention.

The account of the military history of Indiana constitutes another exceedingly valuable contribution. The author gives in much detail the history of Indiana's part in the civil war, including, in addition to the

accounts of the enlistment, the organization and the military service of the state troops, sketches of the measures for war relief and of the confederate raids across the Ohio. Indiana's part in the Spanish-American war is equally well told, while there is as full an account as could be expected at the present time of the state's activities in connection with the war that has just been concluded.

Mr. Esarey's treatment of the different phases of the economic development of Indiana since 1850 is also well done. Notably the chapter devoted to transportation brings out in excellent fashion the problems that confronted the pioneer builder of railroads in the middle west. Another interesting and important topic is the agricultural development of the state, and the author gives appropriate emphasis to the movement for scientific agriculture and the great progress in stock-breeding. The advance made in commercial and industrial fields is also given due consideration.

A native Hoosier, Mr. Esarey describes in a sympathetic vein the social history of Hoosierdom. Especially is this true of the first chapter of this second volume, which treats of the domestic, the religious, and the general life of the period that immediately precedes the civil war. The development of the educational system up to the present time is also sympathetically and adequately sketched. In addition to other social topics, there are excellent critiques of the different authors who in recent years have made the Hoosier name famous.

With all its merits, this volume like the preceding one suffers from the lack of any systematic plan in the arrangement of the chapters on social and economic topics, for they are often interpolated, with no apparent purpose or connection, in the midst of political or military narratives. Thus, chapter XXIII leaves one suspended in mid-air, wondering as to the results from the conduct of the "unworthy" assembly of 1863. Finally, after wading through a detailed chapter on common schools, one on transportation, and one on military activities during the civil war, in chapter XXVII the reader again plunges into the troubled politics of the war period. Such a break in the treatment of so important a period greatly weakens the narrative.

Also, there is a serious lack of analysis. The volume really forms an encyclopedia of the different phases in the development of Indiana since 1850. There is little if any attempt to show the interaction of forces, or to explain the effect of social and economic changes upon political life. The first volume suffers from a similar cause, and the entire work, while as a collection of narratives is of much value, as a history of Indiana possesses neither coherence nor orderly development. Nor has the author paid sufficient attention to literary style. There are numerous col-

loquialisms, and at times the sentence structure is not well worked out. The second volume, too, would be far more useful if there were a fuller index.

Notwithstanding its obvious defects, Mr. Esarey's second volume completes a work of much value. The author has displayed very great patience in digging out and making available an immense amount of valuable material. Such pioneer work is necessary, and should prove the foundation for a shorter, more analytical, and better-jointed history of Indiana. Certainly such a volume is greatly needed. Meanwhile the two volumes should be placed on the reference shelf of every library, and in their pages the student of Indiana and middle western history will find a most valuable record of the origin and progress of the Hoosier state.

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

The frontier state, 1818-1848. By Theodore Calvin Pease, University of Illinois. [Centennial history of Illinois, volume II] (Springfield: Illinois centennial commission, 1919. 475 p. $2.00)

This volume is one of a series written and published by the Illinois centennial commission to place in the hands of the citizenship of Illinois a reliable account of the transformation of a wilderness land into the present state of Illinois. It illustrates the advantages and disadvantages of coöperative authorship. The disadvantages of cross-sectioning are about equaled by the advantages of more careful investigation. Mr. Pease has rightly relied entirely on primary sources — newspapers, state records and manuscripts. One who has not tried can never realize how difficult it is to wring a connected consequential story out of such materials. The writer who produces alleged history from reports of commissions, public speeches, and magazine articles may even die in the belief that he has been a historian. The public has very little appreciation of the vast gulf between the two kinds of history. It is unfortunate that the same name has to be given to the products of both. There is the same fundamental difference between the work of Mr. Pease and that of the commercial or hack historian as between the artist and the photographer.

During the thirty years covered by the volume the problems were primarily political; and the author has devoted twelve of the twenty-two chapters to the organization of the state and the development of political parties. During the first period political activity centered around the leaders and the whole is correctly named the period of personal politics. Even what is known in American history as Jacksonian democracy is only a national case of personal politics. Similarly the

tremendous following of Harrison was primarily personal. During the thirty years the questions of slavery, both state and national, finance, including the bank struggle, internal improvements, and the public lands were threshed out on the Illinois hustings. These questions are the more difficult because no party stood for them but rather on each there was a new alignment. Individuals changed front in bewildering perplexity. Each issue and each individual were influenced to a greater or less extent by still more local issues — the location of the state capital, the location and management of the banks and above all the location of the internal improvements. How considerably these cross-currents operated is shown by a comparison of the conclusions of Mr. Pease with those of the standard historians of the United States. Those who yearn for another period of so-called independent voting should study the history of the northwestern states during the period of personal politics.

Besides the essentially political issues the next in importance were banks and internal improvements. Here Mr. Pease found a trace of party regularity, the democrats usually opposing both, though neither party was able to make either a test of party regularity. Illinois, like its neighbors, tried to meet a real economic need with its state bank but failed and had nothing to show for its effort but a regretful experience. How far this failure was due to poor management, the situation or party politics the author does not say, perhaps it is impossible to tell. Practically the same general experience resulted from the internal improvements. Here the experience of Illinois was similar to that of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, so similar that a change of proper names and figures would make the story apply to any one of the states.

The stories of the Mormon war and the Black Hawk war are peculiar to Illinois and are well told. The general attitude of the people toward the Mormons and the Indians was the same in all the western states.

Little can be said in adverse criticism. One is tempted to say that too much space is given to politics. One would like to read of the everyday life of the folks, for the big work after all was that of transforming the woods and prairies into farms. The chapters on "Illinois in ferment" and "Social advance" are devoted to this subject and for that reason will probably appeal most to the mass of readers. For the corresponding period in Indiana history the reviewer was able to find little in home, church, or school that would yield material for the historian. The home life was dull, hard, and monotonous; the schools were mostly themes for discussion and neighborhood quarrel. Everything was personal and individual. So in the case of Illinois one might in criticising the author for lack of more attention to these subjects only betray the critic's ignorance.

The style of the volume is not as light and easy as it should be for popular use. Many of the sentences are involved so that one frequently has to go back and reread them before one grasps the meaning. This may be due in part to the large amount of detail contained. The reader at times when expecting a clear-cut conclusion is also disappointed in the caution of the author. Especially is this true where blame is in question as in the bank or internal improvements management.

The state is to be congratulated on the excellence of the work of Mr. Pease. The thanks of the people of the whole northwest are due the author for the long, tedious, dishwashing work necessary in the preparation of such a volume.

LOGAN ESAREY

The era of the civil war, 1848-1870. By Arthur Charles Cole, University of Illinois. [Centennial history of Illinois, volume III] (Springfield: Illinois centennial commission, 1919. 499 p. $2.00)

There has been no more notable undertaking in the field of state history than the *Centennial history of Illinois.* Preceded by elaborate efforts to gather materials from archives both at home and abroad, and engaging the serious and prolonged efforts of a group of young scholars who are conversant with the approved methods of contemporary historical science, this effort at comprehensive state history bears sharp contrast to the amateur or catch-penny volumes which have so often passed as histories. These volumes conform also to modern professional canons in the matter of footnotes, bibliographies, and indexes, and withal are most attractive examples of the arts of the printer and binder.

In the third volume of the series, Mr. Cole presents the results of his study of the years 1848-1870 — years of most rapid change, since they carried the state from the frontier stage to that of a modern commonwealth. Approximately half of the pages are claimed by the story of the Kansas-Nebraska struggle, the civil war, and the early stages of reconstruction. The other moiety is devoted to various phases of *Kulturgeschichte* — railroad building, banking, agricultural progress, immigration and emigration, religion and education, the rise of capitalism and the labor movement. The book is plain, narrative history, with little attempt at interpretation, and with no emphasis upon analysis of institutions. One expects to meet much that is familiar in a review of the Kansas-Nebraska act, the origin of the republican party, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the elections of 1860 and 1864, but Mr. Cole's research in newspaper files and unprinted manuscripts has been so extensive that these chapters have much of the value of monographs on the Illinois aspects of these subjects. The great preponderance of source citations

in the footnotes indicates but slight indebtedness to the considerable number of monographs listed in the bibliography. The imposing mass of information contained in the chapters on social and economic history somewhat overcrowds the available space, and imparts a gazetteer-like quality. The author's literary style suffers also under the effort to compress so much into small space, and monotony replaces the art which subordinates detail and brings the large fact into clear relief. There are traces of carelessness at times, as shown by the redundant phrase "prevailing practices of the day" (p. 49), and the expression "won out" (p. 267). Is it by intent that "christian" is decapitalized on page 222 and elsewhere (although not everywhere)? Slips of the pen or type are few: "trans-Atlantic" appears for "transcontinental" (p. 361), "partiotism" for "patriotism" (p. 271), and the legend on the chart at page 178 reads "less than 5%" where "50-55%" is clearly intended. The writer's style appears to good advantage in the longer narrative portions, and at times produces very effective sentences, as in the description of the American party as furnishing "an opportunity for a dark lantern exodus from old party bondage."

One leaves off reading this scholarly volume with a new sense of the difficulty of writing state history. For the historian, as for the statesman, state boundaries are largely artificial. Nearly all matters of large historical consequence in American history are national, or at least sectional, in their scope, and state history is condemned either to treat of the trivial, or to serve as the channel through which local currents may flow into the bosom of the main stream. To write of Illinois in the period of Douglas, and Lincoln, and Grant, and Trumbull — to write of Illinois at a time when one of her citizens was war president and another the field chief of the army — is not to write state history, but national history.

In dealing with topics of less commanding importance there is great danger of losing true perspective. The history of banking and of educational legislation in Illinois, for example, is closely parallel to their history in other states of the northwest, and any adequate treatment of such matters must be at least sectional. Intensive studies within state lines have value chiefly as contributions toward the larger synthesis. The effort at comprehensive state history hardly allows for either of these facts. Even the trained historian will sometimes be misled through the narrowing of the horizon due to the artificial limitations incident to the writing of state history. Is not this the case when Mr. Cole claims an Illinois origin for the Morrill land-grant law for agricultural colleges? Important as may have been the influence of Jonathan B. Turner, other

factors, long at work, contributed to the final result. Eastern states were the scene of considerable activity on behalf of federal aid to agricultural education; indeed, the decline of agriculture in the old states under stress of the competition with the rich, cheap lands of the west imparted much of the impetus to the movement for federal aid, and the votes on the bill showed a sectional alignment, the west opposing and the east favoring the measure.

A curious feature of this volume is the lack of characterization of the *dramatis personae.* Scores of persons who doubtless were men of real flesh and blood, and did their bit in the making of the state, are introduced by name and office, but *exeunt* forthwith never to reappear. Truly, elaborate portraits of these men of secondary note would seem incongruous in association with men whose greatness dispenses with the need of portraiture. Is the author, conscious of the uselessness of characterizing the giants of national stature, embarrassed into silence concerning the men of merely state proportions?

On the whole, one is inclined to attribute such weaknesses as the book may possess largely to the difficulty of the rôle of state historian, and to reaffirm the opinion that the volume, along with the rest of the series, establishes a new standard of effort and excellence in the field of comprehensive state history.

HOMER C. HOCKETT

Starved Rock state park and its environs. By Carl O. Sauer, Gilbert H. Cady, and Henry C. Cowles. [Geographic society of Chicago, bulletin no. 6] (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1918. 148 p. $2.00 net)

That Starved Rock state park offers an interesting laboratory to students of geology, botany, and history, and that it is visited each year by some 75,000 persons are adequate reasons for the preparation of this volume. Such an authoritative study of the region has long been needed as a corrective to the erroneous views heretofore presented in numerous booklets and pamphlets. Each of the writers, Mr. Sauer on geography, Mr. Cady on geology, and Mr. Cowles on botany, has given much time to a scientific survey of the special field which he presents. The historical sketch is equally satisfactory for it is based on such authorities as Margry, Joutel, Charlevoix, Tonti, the Jesuit relations, and Parkman. The sketches and reproductions of photographs constitute an excellent supplement to the text. Those secured by Mr. Frank M. Woodruff of the Chicago academy of sciences are particularly notable. It is to be regretted, however, that the authors, who must all be familiar with the names used on the map prepared by the Illinois state geological survey

and which accompanied the volume, should have applied a number of the traditional names to the canyons, as Curtis, figure 10; Atwood, figure 12.

J. A. James

The forty-niners. A chronicle of the California trail and El Dorado. By Stewart Edward White. [Chronicles of America series, volume 25] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1918. 273 p. $3.50)

The passing of the frontier. A chronicle of the old west. By Emerson Hough. [Chronicles of America series, volume 26] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1918. 181 p. $3.50)

These volumes of the Chronicles of America series, a coöperative history in fifty volumes edited by Allen Johnson, by their physical aspect no less than by the contents of their pages proclaim the advent of a new fashion in the field of American historiography. Attractively, almost luxuriously, printed on an excellent quality of paper, light of weight and of a size to slip with ease into one's coat pocket, with covers elaborately stamped in gold and white on a background of cheerful blue, it is evident at a glance that editor and publisher have coöperated to implant in the minds of prospective purchasers and readers of these volumes a state of pleasant anticipation.

Within the covers there is continued evidence of a design to render permanent the sense of graceful ease which the exterior appearance of the books is calculated to create. We learn from the subtitle page that these are volumes 25 and 26 of the "Abraham Lincoln edition" of the Chronicles of America series, but we meet with no editorial introduction or author's preface, and we are vouchsafed no hint as to what volumes have preceded these in the series, or how many and what will follow — in short, no suggestion concerning the plan and purpose of the work two fragments of which are before us. A hasty survey shows that the average length of the volume is about 42,000 words; and that they may be read through in an evening by even a moderately industrious reader. The author, in each case, occupies a prominent position in the world of contemporary American literature, but among historical workers, prior to the present enterprise, one has been known only obscurely, and the other not at all.

We present these details not for their own sake but with a view to elucidating the broader significance that adheres in them. In the earlier days of American historiography, it is known to all, history writing was identified with the literary art, and our leading historians — Prescott, Motley, Irving, and others — were numbered among our leading men of letters. Francis Parkman was the last and at the same time the

greatest representative of this school of writers. For a full generation now the historical profession in America has been dominated by a different type of scholar. With the expansion of libraries and the development of higher institutions of learning, with the growth of graduate departments in scores of universities and colleges, the writing of history has become an adjunct to the teaching of history in these institutions. More and more it has fallen into the hands of the specialist, whose work as a writer is financed, not from the sale of his writings, but by the monthly stipend received for teaching in the institution which supports him. Some good and some evil consequences have attended this evolution in the character of the historical profession, but the one we choose now to emphasize has been wholly evil. Emanicipated from the necessity of winning the favor of their readers (or, indeed, of winning readers at all), their zeal abetted, doubtless, by the influence of the German universities, our university historians have divorced history from literature, and, in their zeal for the pursuit of facts, have ignored the need of presenting these facts in acceptable literary form. As a consequence, the modern American historian has lost in the main, as he deserves to lose, the attention of the reading public.

Signs of a reaction from the prevailing style of historical writing have not been wholly wanting in recent years. Now comes a leading professor in one of our greatest universities as editor of a coöperative history of America in half a hundred volumes with the university press as sponsor of the enterprise. But instead of two of his professional colleagues, the editor impresses men whose literary reputation has been gained almost wholly in another field to write the volumes before us; and the publisher dresses them in a garb which advertises as far as they may be seen the fact that here is history which is consciously different in ideal and execution from that which has customarily held the boards. Instead of the indifference of writer and publisher to the pleasure of the reader, to which we have long been accustomed, the projectors of the present enterprise have done their best to make the reading of history agreeable, and even to impress the reader of their volumes with the feeling that the writers of them enjoyed their task. We hail the new dispensation with joy, even though it may appear, on examination, that the writers have sacrificed some desirable qualities to which we have been accustomed in the older type of history.

The most important factor in determining the character of the works before us in their brevity. But little over forty thousand words with which to chronicle the passing of the frontier or the history of the forty-niners! The single work of McMaster would fill thirty-seven or thirty-eight of these volumes; Rhodes' history would fill about twenty-

eight; a single volume of the *Brittanica* is equivalent to thirty of these chronicles. Evidently, then, the authors could attempt no more than a very general survey of their respective subjects. In this attempt Mr. Hough has succeeded far better than Mr. White. In fact, given the plan and scope of his volume, it is difficult to see how his execution of it could have been materially improved. The frontier whose passing he describes is the "cow" country of the sixties to the nineties; its hero, the cowboy, "dearest" "of all the babes of that primeval mother, the West," although, it is true, the author's allegiance wavers momentarily while he pens this striking tribute to a character whose epic for the most part will remain forever unsung: "The chief figure of the American West, the figure of the ages, is not the long-haired, fringed-legging man riding a raw-boned pony, but the gaunt and sad-faced woman, following her lord where he might lead, her face hidden in the same ragged sunbonnet which had crossed the Appalachians and the Missouri long before. That was America, my brethren! There was the seed of America's wealth. There was the great romance of all America — the woman in the sunbonnet; and not, after all, the hero with the rifle across his saddle horn."

To the historian who can impart to his pages vitality such as this, much might be forgiven. But in the present instance this is unnecessary. Mr. Hough has long known his subject both from reading and from personal observation; he has even written books about it, some of which are levied upon rather freely in preparing the present one. The wisdom of including in this volume chapter v on "The mines" is perhaps open to question. We question, also, the wisdom of devoting sixteen pages (almost one-tenth of the volume) to the story of the ill-fated dinner party. In the main, however, the work is well balanced and the editorial plan is creditably executed.

Less successful has Mr. White been in dealing with the forty-niners. Here, if ever in American history, was a subject adapted to the requirements of the Chronicles of America series — a romantic adventure of epic proportions, lived by men and women some of whom are still in our midst yet belonging to a world of affairs as remote in all respects save that of mere chronology as the age of the Caesars. But sad work, on the whole, does Mr. White make of it. The book is really made up of two fairly distinct parts: the first 160 pages dealing with the subject matter which gives title to the volume, and the remaining 110 pages with the San Francisco vigilantes of 1856. The latter section is by far the more spirited, and constitutes an excellent bit of narrative taken from real life. But it harmonizes with the scheme of the chronicles, or indeed with the earlier portion of Mr. White's volume itself, no

better than would one of the colossal paintings from the rotunda of the national capitol with the living room of the average American home. The author has sacrificed his volume for a postscript, and the postscript has been made the most important part of the work.

Even to the earlier portion of the work, which does conform in the main to the general editorial scheme, but moderate commendation can be given. What shall be said of the sense of proportion displayed in allotting but nine out of the 265 pages in the narrative to the crossing of the plains? Or why should a chapter twice as long be devoted to the general history of Mormonism, the only conceivable bearing of which for the subject of the volume proceeds from the relatively insignificant fact that the gold seekers who crossed the plains usually dickered and sometimes quarreled with the Mormons while passing through their settlements in the vicinity of Great Salt lake? With certain reservations we welcome the new fashion in historical writing which the appearance of these volumes portends. But better expositions of it than the present work of Mr .White must be produced if the fashion is to persist.

M. M. Quaife

Teton Sioux music. By Frances Densmore. [Smithsonian institution, Bureau of American ethnology, bulletin 61] (Washington: Government printing office, 1918. 561 p.)

In this volume there has been made a very substantial addition to the results already obtained from similar studies carried on for many years among the Indian tribes of the United States. Miss Densmore seems to have been even more successful with this tribe than she was among the Chippewa, where she did her initial work. Indian music has been for a long time a comparatively unworked field, as the musical training requisite for accurate study of the subject was not included in the scientific attainments possessed by the scholars who have done most of the ethnological research among our native tribes. Only recently there has been found opportunity for the same careful study of this branch of the subject that has been given to the others that have appeared in years past in the reports of the Bureau of ethnology.

The present work deals with the music of the Teton Sioux and contains the tabulated analysis of six hundred songs, including those of the Chippewa already used. (See bulletins 45 and 53 of the Bureau of American ethnology.) The typical songs of these two tribes can therefore be compared in detail from the tables and other data supplied in this study.

The musical compositions of the Teton Sioux are arranged into two groups, the older songs and those composed within the last fifty years.

Forty singers were used and 240 songs were recorded by the phonograph.

The songs recorded cover a wide range of subjects and illustrate very well the culture of the tribe. First in importance stand the songs connected with the important tribal ceremonies. The oldest of these celebrates the coming to the Dakota Indians of the first of the buffalo herds. They were at this time a poor and obscure tribe living on the Atlantic seaboard. By means of the ritual and songs connected with this ancient ceremony, taught them by the sacred white buffalo maiden, the first stragglers from a great buffalo herd reached their village. The tribe migrated in search of these animals, using the trails left by the buffalo. After many wanderings they finally reached the great plains west of the Mississippi. Their descendants later occupied this region, absorbing or driving out most of the original occupants. This is fairly typical of the ceremonial songs that number over fifty, principally having to do with the sun dance, the characteristic ceremony of the great plains. Songs having to do with the ritual of secret societies stand next in number and importance, some thirty in number. A long list of war songs has been recorded, and many typical songs of the chase. A very important group of songs are those composed and sung in honor of some individual. These include many of the later compositions though some are very old and have served to commemorate many individual heroes whose names have succeeded each other as the older hero is forgotten and a later candidate for honors displaces him in popular recognition. In a lesser group are included songs connected with the playing of games, children's songs and love songs. Altogether the record is thoroughly characteristic of the region and expresses very completely the predominant interests of this tribe of the Dakota Indians.

Accompanying the musical record, the notation and interpretation of the songs are given in considerable detail, the story of each important song, a description of the ritual or ceremony belonging to it, and photographs of the performers and the instruments used in the ceremony. The writer has omitted no essential detail in her research that might make her study a more accurate piece of Indian life. This bulletin is soon to be followed by one containing her latest report on Indian music, a study of the music of the Mandan and Hidatsa.

O. G. Libby

In the Alaskan wilderness. By George Byron Gordon, Sc.D., F.R.G.S. (Philadelphia: John C. Winston company, 1917. 247 p. $3.50 net)

The book before us, which, according to the author, makes no claim to be other than an accurate record of personal adventure and individual

effort, describes a journey through then unknown portions of central Alaska made in 1907 by the author and his brother. It is dedicated to the latter, Lieutenant MacLaren Gordon, who was killed in action during the battle of the Somme, October 21, 1916. The journey is certainly remarkable when one considers that it was made without guides through a country of which not even sketch maps were in existence and that in reality the party, though small, experienced no serious difficulties. They carried out the plan within the time set, accomplished without accident the course decided upon, and demonstrated the geographical relations much as had been predicted. The delay in the publication of the results was not intentional as it had been planned to combine with them more complete observations to be made on a later trip; but this hope was not realized and the author decided to publish the record of the original expedition as they appear in the book under review.

The purpose of the journey was not primarily geographical. It was undertaken, in first instance, to give opportunity for the study of the native life of the districts explored. But as a matter of fact, the major portion of the country traversed was almost without human inhabitants, and in the opinion of the author has never been more richly populated despite the striking abundance of the game that ranges over it. On the lower Kuskokwim was found an opportunity to study an aboriginal population that apparently preserved the ancient customs and manner of living in truly primitive fashion. This is of especial value since the Alaskan native is so susceptible to new influences that the time is near at hand when it will be too late to get any records or evidences of primitive conditions.

Mr. Gordon believes that his party was the first to cross Alaska from Tanana to Bering sea by the route which was followed. Carrying their outfit in a small canoe, the two men left Fairbanks on June 26, 1907, passed down the Tanana and up the Kantishna to Lake Minchumina. This large body of water lies about north of Mt. Denali, separated from it by the great stretch of rich rolling prairies that now include the great national game preserve. They were tempted to remain here, but subsequently decided to continue despite the attractions of the surroundings.

In describing this region the author dwells again and again on the wonderful impressions created by Denali, the great mountain, rightly named in the language of the Indians "The Most High." Archdeacon Hudson Stuck of Alaska has voiced a wonderful plea in his books for the preservation of this ancient and appropriate name; and thinking along the same line Gordon says (p. 77): "I was impressed during all

my intercourse with the few Indians in Alaska that their geographical knowledge is very considerable. They travel extensively and they have names for every topographical feature of the country. These names have always certain attributes to recommend them. They have been spoken by untold generations of men and handed down in the native tongues of the land from unknown antiquity. They are, therefore, a part of the inheritance of the human race and especially of Americans. These place names have moreover, in each instance, a most appropriate significance. They carry with them local associations of special meaning and they hand down long traditions of man's relation with nature.

"It has always appeared to me that such arguments as these should make a powerful appeal to American geographers and explorers and to the national conscience. It is more than a matter of sentiment; but even if I were appealing to sentiment alone, I should expect the Indian name of a place to make a nobler appeal in this particular connection than the name of any man in our own time."

From Lake Minchumina they crossed by a short portage to the headwaters of the upper Kuskokwim or Tichininik and, descending the river to Bering sea, reached the end of a canoe trip that totaled over twelve hundred miles. After various adventures in a small steamer the party made Nome, and the last boat for Seattle.

It would be impossible within the space at command to refer in detail to the interesting records of adventure and important observations on village life and other native customs, to the effects of the wilderness on the white man, and to the influence on the simple natives of the first mesengers of a higher civilization that reach his home. Mr. Gordon has written an interesting book which will be read with pleasure by all who are fond of adventure or seek information with regard to this little-known quarter of the world. The archeological and ethnological observations and the illustrations of the dress, basketry, weapons, and picture writing together with some data on the vocabularies and on the folk lore of these peoples give to the book a permanent place in the literature on Alaskan native tribes.

HENRY B. WARD

History of the United States. By John Holladay Latané, Ph.D., professor of American history, Johns Hopkins university. (New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1918. 589 p.)

The name of Mr. Latané on the title-page of a book on American history promises scholarship, a progressive spirit, and an emphasis upon foreign relations. The present volume puts into simple and agreeable form the results of scholarly research. Although designed for a text-

book, it nevertheless is very readable. The story of our relations with other countries is more fully and more truthfully brought out than in any high school text with which the reviewer is acquainted. In view of our attainment of world consciousness and of our impending entrance into a league of nations this treatment is very timely. The organization of the book, however, causes a little disappointment. The author confesses to a compromise between the topical and the chronological methods of presentation. Like most compromises it is neither one thing nor the other. It would seem that the caution of the publishers' counting-room put too much restraint upon the progressive impulse of the author. Will the day ever come when some author will gain the opportunity to recount processes and movements in history and to forget chronology except in so far as it is necessary for the interpretation of these movements? In our history since the reconstruction following the civil war, Mr. Latané comes nearest to a satisfactory treatment of a period. According to our view he has given the best and the truest organization of this era to be found in any textbook. The cultural and religious elements in American life are almost totally ignored throughout the book. Why should these phases of our history so commonly be omitted by textbook writers? Surely they are important enough to be counted significant factors in our national development. The teaching apparatus of the book is generally commendable. The maps are reasonably numerous and are unusually usable because of their simplicity. It would seem that the map on page 363 should show the railroads, if it is to be of service in understanding military operations. With the great wealth of illustrative material available in these days, it seems rather unfortunate to limit the illustrations of a book almost wholly to portraits. The reviewer believes it would be well to revert to the old custom of printing the articles of confederation along with the declaration of independence and the constitution in the appendix of textbooks. The articles certainly are needed for reference and often they are not readily obtainable by pupils. The most important paragraphs of the declarations of rights of 1765 and 1774 are also very desirable. Mr. Latané has wisely omitted "thought questions" from his chapter ends. The good teacher does not need them and the poor teacher does not know how to use them. In conclusion, it is fair to say that this book is, upon the whole, one of the best now available for high school use.

EDWARD C. PAGE

School history of the United States. By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., professor of government, Harvard university. (New York: American book company, 1918. 505 p.)

The present demand for an adequate treatment of the westward movement, social and industrial forces, and recent history is met in an unrestrained and natural manner in this new elementary text. Written with simple directness, the book is pedagogically suitable for the upper grades. Illustrations, maps, references, questions, summaries, appendices, and bibliography can be criticized only on the side of too great profuseness and elaboration. Considerable material of a novel character for such a work is included, especially in the realm of social history. Such chapters as "Colonial life," "Colonial labor and business," "How people lived a century ago," "Going west," "Young America (1829-1861)," "The people during the civil war," and "The people's life (1900-1916)" reveal the author at his best, and are richly illuminating and vivid. The apportionment is open to little criticism. The teacher will welcome the clear account of colonial history, the keen characterizations of public men, the logical account of the slavery question, the unusually comprehensive treatment of the various sections, the lucid account of the Monroe doctrine and our relations with South America. The book is singularly free from errors. In the opinion of the reviewer a very high standard has been set by this worthy addition to the author's numerous textbooks. Incidentally, Mr. Hart shows ingenuity in finding new titles by which to distinguish his new books from his many earlier publications.

THEODORE C. BLEGEN

Supervised study in American history. By Mabel E. Simpson. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 278 p. $1.20)

This book is designed for teachers of American history in the seventh and eighth grades. It stresses the necessity of teaching pupils how to study. The author describes in detail the plans she has worked out in accomplishing this end. These plans include various types of lessons, such as preview, expository, inductive, deductive, appreciation, and habituation lessons and a so-called socialized recitation. Doubtless every teacher must learn to develop her own plans through experience, yet suggestions from the successful experience of others should be of material assistance. The book assumes a conventional point of view as to subject matter; it does not, in fact, attempt to go beyond the problems of classroom methods. A good deal has been said recently about the new tests of efficiency which are being applied to the matter and manner of classroom exercises. This little manual will be of material as-

sistance in helping toward that readjustment which must soon come to much that is out-of-date in our grade teaching of history.

Work and play in colonial days. By Mary Holbrook MacElroy, State normal school, Oswego, New York. [Everychild's series] (New York: Macmillan company, 1917. 163 p.)

This is a very serviceable little book. It is well adapted to its intended use as supplementary reading for children of the grade schools. The style is clear and suitable, the subjects of the book are well chosen, and the whole is excellently presented. Here a child will get a simple and wholesome account and view of the pioneer children of old New England. The games, playthings, and clothes of the youngsters, their manners, discipline, and tasks, their schooling and books, are all set forth in an intimate and appealing manner. The test of the book is in its use. I have tried it on a group of children of about six to eight years of age, and found that it not only held their attention, but stimulated the asking of questions.

W. T. Root

National governments and the world war. By Frederick A. Ogg, professor of political science in the University of Wisconsin, and Charles A. Beard, director of the bureau of municipal research, New York City. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 603 p. $2.50)

Mr. Ogg and Mr. Beard, who have written extensively-used books on government, were eminently qualified to write a text for use while the struggle was on to "make the world safe for democracy." First, they contrast English, American, and French ideals as embodied in certain well-known state papers and in speeches of statesmen with the mouthings of William II and the constitution of Prussia, where one was "king, by the grace of God." Then follow 150 pages devoted almost entirely to the national government of the United States. This portion includes a chapter on our government in war time which sets forth its varied activities in winning the war. The governments of the allies take up 370 pages. One need not conclude from the small amount of space devoted to "Democracy in Italy" (16 pages) that democracy there is altogether like snakes in Ireland. The authors frankly confess its backward condition, but add that "in thirty years Italy has achieved a record of economic growth and social reform of which any nation may be proud," and speak somewhat optimistically of the future of democracy in that land. Nothing is said about Russia, which was one of the allies down to the close of 1917.

In the 121 pages devoted to the central powers (96 to Germany, 25 to Austria-Hungary) one finds good illustrations of unfree governments.

The people of central Europe realized their condition and began to set their houses in order before the forms of the book under review were closed. With the cessation of the war this part of the book became mainly of historical interest. Whether the war resulted in making that part of the world safe for democracy remains to be seen.

Two final chapters are devoted to "American war aims in relation to government" and "The problem of international government." As the reader reviews our war aims as expressed in President Wilson's famous fourteen points and in his various speeches, which were applauded here and, with a few exceptions, at least quietly acquiesced in abroad, and then turns to the peace treaty he cannot help wondering a little about mental reservations in some parts of the world. In the last chapter the authors have given us a good resumé of the historical developments leading to international government, but as the book closed before the peace conference met they could only suggest and predict. In the light of recent events one is inclined to ask if the league really does rest where they say such a league must rest, "upon a *status quo* which is maintained not simply as was the Concert after 1815, because it is a legal fact and its disturbance would be inconvenient to the rulers, but because it is inherently equitable."

While the authors have been very frank in pointing out the lack of certain elements of political democracy in the governments of the allies, they have given little hint of the profound unrest disturbing these countries, an unrest born of the conviction that political democracy is only a mockery when coupled with an industrial autocracy. It is very doubtful if the United States entered the war to make the world safe for anything except political democracy, but the doom of industrial democracy is sealed. Until the time comes for writing a new book on the new democracy the book under review will help to an understanding of conditions that were in some countries and still are in others.

David Y. Thomas

German submarine warfare. A study of its methods and spirit, including the crime of the "Lusitania." A record of observations and evidence. By Wesley Frost, United States consul, formerly stationed at Queenstown (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1918. 243 p. $1.50 net)

Without claiming to be anything more than "a record of observations and evidence" drawn from his official investigations, Mr. Frost's study nevertheless has a very high value. His favorable location as American consul at Queenstown made possible the taking of the detailed testimony of the survivors of between fifty and sixty submarined vessels which carried Americans either as crew or passengers. His own antecedents

and personality — those of "a man of legal habit of mind, well-disposed toward the Germans, and of international-pacifist tendencies," as he himself tells us (p. 165) — creates confidence in his sobriety and thoroughness of method in gathering evidence. And his skill in grouping and presenting his facts enable him, in the compass of his 243 pages, to convey what is probably a more vivid and accurate picture of the tactics and motives of German submarine warfare than can be found elsewhere in the English language.

The first two-thirds of the book deal, in nine chapters, with special phases of that warfare, topically discussed. Of the German practice of shelling defenseless vessels, Mr. Frost says, while naming nineteen vessels as examples: "I can cite you instance after instance . . . in which a frail and unarmed craft has made submission and pleaded for quarter, like a little dog that rolls on its back and begs, and then has been pounded and raked with shellfire, sometimes with the most sickening casualties" (p. 31). The motive of such wanton bombardment, and indeed of the whole policy of submarine *Schrecklichkeit*, he finds in the intent to terrorize merchant seamen of all nations so as to make impossible the sending of enemy and neutral shipping into the zone of submarine operations. Ships which attempt to escape, freight ships presumed to be armed, the special efforts made to sink passenger liners, the frequent brutality of the contact of submarine crews and their victims, and the desertion of boats laden with survivors in stormy weather and at times even 1,200 miles from land — all these are themes of separate chapters. To these are added a chapter on German motives and morals, and one of summary and appraisal. Under the former heading Mr. Frost advances, as part of the explanation of what he calls the "spiritual leprosy" of the Germans, a theory of "continental overpopulation, . . . the spiritual counterpart of the Malthusian Law of Overpopulation," which is interesting if not wholly convincing.

The narrative of the *Lusitania* sinking, which Mr. Frost calls the "consummate quintessence of depravity" (p. 80), occupies the last third of the volume. It is all the more poignant and convincing because of its simplicity of tone and absence of any striving for rhetorical effect.

The lack of an index is one of the few faults of this otherwise excellent book.

S. B. H.

America in France. By Major Frederick Palmer. (New York: Dodd, Mead and company, 1918. 479 p. $1.75)

This volume presents in a systematic manner an account of the American expeditionary force in France. It is written by a famous war

correspondent whose opportunities for observation, as a member of General Pershing's staff, were almost unexampled. He was with the force in France from the beginning, and was evidently almost unrestricted as to range of observation. "Under the spell of our marvelous achievement, which is the greatest story any American has ever had to tell, I have written about it [the expeditionary force] as I knew it through its phases of building, training, fighting and of unremitting effort until we had won the Saint Mihiel salient and broken the old German line in the Argonne battle." The title, the author's reputation, his personal participation, and his high conception of his task lead the reader to expect a notable book.

The work on the whole falls somewhat short of one's expectations. Its limitations are those of most early war books, hurriedly prepared. It was written to meet an urgent popular demand. It tells only a small part of the story of America in France, and this in a sketchy fashion. The early portion of the book is of course more comprehensive than the latter. The enormous growth of the project made it altogether impossible for one observer adequately to follow its progress. The book was written moreover before the signing of the armistice. Starting with the departure of General Pershing for France, it deals with the formulation of plans, the "blue print" era, the building of an organization, the arrival of the first troops and their disposition in Lorraine, the gradual expansion of the enterprise in all its manifold directions. A tremendous working energy, under direction, changes the blue prints to realities, additional troops arrive and proceed with their training, and by the time of Secretary Baker's visit the project has become a gigantic one. The latter half of the book deals with the problems created by the German offensive of March 21, the hurrying of the American program, Cantigny, the Marne, Belleau Wood, Vaux, divisions with the English, defensive fighting, the drive toward Soissons, Vierzy, Berzy-le-Sec, the Ourcq, the Vesle, Saint Mihiel, and the Argonne. It is somewhat unfortunate that the book should close with the battle of the Argonne, and not with the armistice, but a second edition will doubtless complete the story. A short and unsatisfactory chapter on aviation is included. Scores of interesting topics are touched upon which can not be mentioned within the limits of this review. Major Palmer writes with the skill and ease of a practiced journalist, and presents a vivid and stirring picture of American achievement. The book is a stimulating promise of what may sometime be written, when circumstances make possible an adequate history of the part played by the American army in the winning of the war.

THEODORE C. BLEGEN

Naval power in the war (1914-1918). By C. C. Gill, commander, United States navy. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1919. 302 p. $1.50)

Many years must indeed elapse before we can write about the great war just closing with the cold-blooded scientific precision with which we handle the campaigns of Napoleon, but that fact does not prevent the publication of useful and enlightening books on the more recent subject.

Commander Gill's volume can fairly claim the above commendation. The majority of the chapters are based upon the lectures the author gave to the midshipmen in the Annapolis naval academy. They were next published in the *New York Times current history magazine.* Now they appear in book form along with considerable new matter, especially a chapter relating to the naval side of the Dardanelles operations.

Such a work can contain few startling disclosures, and there is the obvious pressure upon an author still in the active service of the navy to refrain from many political allusions, or from indulging in statements critical of the strategy and tactics of various high officers. This detracts from the readability and general value of the book, and makes some parts seem a little dry and impersonal. In no other convenient volume, however, can an American find so clear and on the whole so non-technical an account of the Coronel and Falkland engagements and of the various encounters in the North sea, culminating in the indecisive battle of Jutland. The diagrams of the different engagements are clear and helpful, and the language entirely within reach of the non-nautical.

The chapter on the Dardanelles attack is probably the best in the book, and brings out clearly the various factors which brought to nought what was for the British a gallant and promising beginning. It is rightly explained that the egregious blunder in lading the transports, so that the needful artillery and munitions were buried in the holds under tons of tentage and other impedimenta, thereby occasioning nearly a month's delay in beginning the land attack, was probably the one thing which was ruinous to the success of the entire expedition, and incidentally it may be added probably sealed the fate of Russia.

Commander Gill is lenient in his treatment of Jellicoe in the Jutland battle, but he makes it very clear that that admiral hardly proved himself to be a Nelson.

In brief this unpretending book is genuinely helpful toward the understanding of a very important phase of the war.

William S. Davis

A college man in khaki. Letters of an American in the British artillery. By Wainwright Merrill. Edited with an introduction by Charles M. Stearns. (New York: George H. Doran company, [1918]. 234 p. $1.50 net)

We have been surfeited with war books, yet Wainwright Merrill's *A college man in khaki* comes as a refreshing contribution to the ever-growing collection. It is unique in scope and point of view. Delightfully subjective, it is yet free from the introspective undercurrent so evident in many books of this class.

Strictly speaking, the story of *A college man in khaki* is only a prelude to the war, leading up to the big theme, and then pausing before the great climax, pausing to end in complete silence. When in 1917 England sent out a call for volunteers, Wainwright Merrill enlisted in the Canadian army. It was with the joy of a man who is united after a long absence with his mother country that Wainwright Merrill greeted England for the first time. During his spare moments, he explored England in the spirit of a child investigating the attic of his ancestral home — each new object steeped in tradition. Her literature, her tradition and history, he knew and loved. In writing to his friends he lingered over these points with the delight of a connoisseur. So in one of his letters he playfully describes Christ's Hospital: "You have heard of Charles Lamb and S. T. Coleridge, mayhap, what time you pursued the Anglic muse? Well yesterday I saw them in effigy; saw their quaint cloaks, stocks and shoes, but on bright young British commoners whom the Army has not greatly bothered yet; . . . I remember Lamb's essay on Christ's Hospital in the chronicles of the gentle Elia: I often pictured to myself what life must have been like in the dear old city, hard by Newgate, and that ancient monolith, now so changed, the Old Bailey."

Life was to Merrill a great adventure. War was to him a "filthy old show," but his unfailing optimism foresaw "the noble end which we seek out of the ruck and jetsam of death and broken men and lasting sorrow."

Passing lightly over the hardships, lingering long over the joys of free hours well spent, full of an inborn optimism, such is Wainwright Merrill, *A college man in khaki.*

ANITA LIBMAN

War and the coming peace. The moral issue. By Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott company, 1918. 144 p. $1.00 net)

It is decidely refreshing to find among the multitude of books on the war one in which the author emphasizes the spiritual factors of the

great struggle. Nearly every other aspect of the war has been dealt with in considerable detail. The author of this little work lays especial stress on the moral aspect of the war and in doing so he goes far to explain the remarkable extent to which the war has enlisted great and small nations in one common cause. The desire for national trade or territorial growth, economic competition, ancient racial hatreds — these all play some part in the world struggle but together or singly they do not sufficiently explain the mustering of forces by land and sea against the German menace.

The author divides his subject into two parts, war as a moral issue and the problem of a world peace. There is an obvious advantage in discussing the problems of peace after having shown the moral grounds for entering war. Especially to be commended is the careful analysis of the transformation of the idealistic, patriotic, and progressive German of 1814 into the willing tool of an autocratic and imperial-minded master a century later. From the standpoint of a rational philosophy we can thus see why a just and abiding peace can never be secured upon any other foundation than that of universal brotherhood. Peace as well as war is clearly demonstrated to be essentially a moral issue involving the well-being of all nations for an indefinite period of time.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

One of the most delightful annual meetings of the Mississippi valley historical association was the one held in St. Louis, May 8-10. The local committee had made excellent arrangements for the comfort and pleasure of the members of the association and had provided for a number of social functions, including several luncheons, a drive through the beautiful parks of St. Louis, and a trip to the very interesting Cahokia mounds. The rooms of the Missouri historical society in the Jefferson memorial building proved ideal headquarters, while meetings were also held at Washington university and St. Louis university.

The program, an exceptionally good one, was carried out practically as announced. Following the admirable precedent already established, each meeting was devoted to some particular phase of history; the papers in general illustrated the value of the association as a means of stimulating research in the history of the Mississippi valley. The varied subjects and the fact that the topics were distributed over the entire region gave particular interest to the program. The attendance was gratifying; among the seventy or more members of the association who registered were representatives of institutions scattered from Minnesota to Texas.

At the business meeting Mr. M. M. Quaife was elected to the office of president for the coming year, with Mrs. Paine continuing as secretary-treasurer. Mr. Solon J. Buck, Mr. R. B. Way, and Mr. C. W. Ramsdell were made members of the executive committee for three years. Mr. I. J. Cox was named as chairman of this committee, and Mr. Eugene M. Violette and Miss Frances Morehouse were made members of its teachers' section. To succeed the three members of the board of editors whose term had expired the association chose Mr. James F. Willard, Mr. Archibald Henderson, and Mr. Arthur Doughty.

The next annual meeting will be held at Greencastle, Indiana, upon an invitation extended by De Pauw university through Mr. W. W. Sweet and Mr. W. W. Carson. It is possible that arrangements may be made to spend one day at Purdue university in Lafayette.

A joint session with the American historical association will be held in December in Cleveland; Mr. I. J. Cox will represent the Mississippi valley historical association on the program committee for this meeting.

Because of conditions induced by the war the committee of the American historical association in charge of the military historical prize has decided not to hold the contest this year. Notice of the competition will be given at some future date.

Mr. A. F. Pollard of the University of London has issued a statement summarizing the opportunities for advanced historical research in London. This is done with a view to fostering an interflow of students between Great Britain and the United States. Attention is called in the report to the Public Record office, the British museum, the archives of government departments, and libraries like those of the Royal Colonial institute and similar bodies, where much material may be found suitable for intensive study. The University of London, through three of its schools, University college, King's college, and the School of economics and political science, offers unlimited opportunities in graduate research.

The American historical association maintains a room in the Royal historical society, 22 Russell Square, managed by a committee of which Lord Bryce is chairman, for the purpose of furnishing information with regard to opportunities for study in all parts of Great Britain. The American university union, London branch, 16 Pall Mall East, acts in a similar capacity.

How a journalist would handle the history of the war may be seen by consulting the *Popular history of the war* by Merton M. Wilner, assistant editor of the *Buffalo Express*. But little discrimination is used by him in evaluation of historical data. He writes with the assurance of a man who has all the needed source and secondary material at hand. Such treatment of history in the making is obviously to be discouraged. On the other hand, Mr. Wilner should be commended for his chronological table of the war, and for the excellent maps which supplement his narrative.

In many and varied channels has the muse of history been made to serve. Especially in the last few years have there appeared so many interpolations on history as to induce an attitude of chronic scepticism on the part of the historian. So it is that one wonders at first glance for what audience Philip Robert Dillon has prepared his *American anniversaries: every day in the year* (New York: Philip R. Dillon publishing company, 1919. 364 p. $2.50), in which he has included seven hundred and fifty events in American history, many of them well-known, many of them obscure. Analysis shows that to at least three classes of readers the book will prove helpful. The overworked grade teacher will here find in tabulated form data convenient for classroom

use; newspaper men might well turn to it as a friend in need when other spacefillers are exhausted; and women's clubs will undoubtedly find this handbook a valuable aid in planning programs.

A volume by Roland G. Usher entitled *The story of the pilgrims for children* (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 141 p. $1.25) presents in a most vivid manner the juvenile story which covers the same ground as the author's more serious study of *The pilgrims and their history*. The illustrations are numerous and excellent.

Despite the great handicap under which the Library of congress has operated during the fiscal year ending June, 1918, owing to the withdrawal of members of the staff for military service, Mr. Herbert Putnam's report shows that decided progress was made during that year. Many valuable accessions have been added to the shelves of the library. In the field of *Orientalia,* two works of the Ming dynasty were secured. Among manuscript additions the purchase of a collection of Thomas Jefferson papers may be noted; also the Jeremiah S. Black papers, covering the period 1836-1889. Many other notable accessions are included in the *Report of the librarian of congress and report of the superintendent of the library building and grounds.*

"The rebellion of Tupac-Amaru II, 1780-1781," by Philip Ainsworth Means; and "The United States merchant ships in the Rio de la Plata (1801-1809), as shown by early newspapers," by Charles Lyon Chandler, constitute two leading editorials in the *Hispanic American historical review* for February, 1919.

In the June and September issue of the *Transactions of the Royal society of Canada,* Benjamin Sulte has contributed a discussion of the French in the west in 1671, "Les Francais dans l'Ouest en 1671." Gustave Lanctôt, in his "Le dernier effort de la France au Canada," treats briefly the activities of the French in Canada during the years 1759-1760.

In the January, 1919, number of *Le bulletin des recherches historiques, appears* "L'inventaire des biens de Lambert Closse," a soldier and settler of Montreal in 1662. In the ensuing number "Le projet de conquête de la Nouvelle-York de M. de Callières en 1689" is concluded.

"John C. Calhoun and the secession movement of 1850," by Herman V. Ames, in the *Proceedings of the American antiquarian society* (April, 1918), analyzes at greater length and in more detail than the subject has been accorded before, the organized sectional movement which culminated a decade later in the civil war.

In a paper of purely economic interest contributed to the *American economic review* (supplement, March, 1919), by Richard T. Ely and Charles J. Galpin, analyzing the question of "Tenancy in an ideal system of land ownership," mention is made of "great estates coming down from generation to generation, like the Scully Estates in the Mississippi Valley." It is in the hope that some enterprising historian will make a study of the Scully estates, which are the largest of their kind in the Mississippi valley, that attention is called to this article.

In the *Political science quarterly* for December, 1918, the discriminating reader will find four scholarly discussions of problems covering a wide field. "The public finance of Santo Domingo," by Fred Rogers Fairchild is a searching analysis of the financial problems of the Dominican government since 1905. "Hindu political philosophy," by Benoy Kumar Sarkar, gives to occidental civilization the elusive oriental point of view. "Limitations of the Ricardian theory of rent" is continued from the September *Quarterly* by William R. Camp. Of interest to the historian is a discussion by Dixon Ryan Fox on "The economic status of New York whigs."

"War relief work" edited by J. P. Lichtenberger for the *Annals of the American academy of political and social science* is a compilation of the reports of experts in every branch of relief work during the period of the war. "The Academy has had in mind two principal objects in presenting this volume to its readers. First, to provide . . . accurate information in regard to the whole subject of war relief work at home and abroad. . . Second, to contribute to the development of that large and wholesome public social consciousness without which it would be difficult if not impossible to win the war."

"Executive responsibility in Illinois," by Governor Frank O. Lowden, and "The Illinois civil administrative code," by Charles E. Woodward of Ottawa, Illinois, are two items of interest in the *Proceedings of the Academy of political science* for July, 1918.

Loosely interpreting the word "literary," Thomas F. Meehan in an article entitled "Catholic literary New York" has brought together some interesting data on Catholic New York during the era 1800-1840. Historical material which even remotely has no literary significance is here included — such as the statement that Dominick Lynch, a merchant, during his student days at Georgetown college recited the eulogy at the memorial exercises for the death of George Washington. No use is made of contemporary Catholic newspapers and periodicals, with which the author indicates his acquaintance. The article furnishes intimate glimpses of the ambitions and interests of many prominent Catholics of

early New York. That side of the discussion might well have been enlarged. The paper may be found in the January, 1919, number of the *Catholic historical review.*

"Lincoln's plan for colonizing the emancipated negroes" is a study by Charles H. Wesley in the latest issue of the *Journal of negro history.* Among the reprinted documents are some excerpts from letters and articles by Benjamin Franklin showing his active participation in the emancipation movement.

The degree of progress made by a colony may often be gauged by the age of its library. No sooner does it outgrow some of the earmarks of a frontier community than it begins to aspire to signs of culture. Such seems to have been the case in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where "The Juliana library company" was organized in 1759. The story of this venture is written by Mr. Charles I. Landis, in the January number of the *Pennsylvania magazine of history and biography.* Simon Gratz has begun the publication of the letters of Thomas Rodney in the same issue of the *Quarterly.*

In the October, 1918, issue of the *Virginia magazine of history and biography,* the "Minutes of the council and general court, 1622-1629" are continued and "The Preston papers," relating to western Virginia, begin publication.

That the first American frontier should have been the stage chosen for the rehearsal of a communistic republic which was to antedate the French revolution by about fifty years, is a fact known to few people. Yet it was here that an obscure dreamer and idealist, one who has since passed into oblivion, hoped to set up a *Société générale* founded upon the principles of *liberty* and *equality.* He hoped to develop under the protection of "an independent confederacy of Southern Indians and in its midst, a communistic establishment which would serve as a model for a republic which might later be set up in France." Priber, the author of this utopia, hoped to see in his "Kingdom of Paradise," not only civil and political, but also economic equality. He did in fact win the Indians over to his point of view. The experiment was, however, never actually put to test. These ideas were judged to be a menace to the English colonial system, especially as their author preached complete Indian independence. Priber was accused of plotting in favor of the French, and his last years were spent in a South Carolina prison.

The story of this "friend to the natural rights of mankind" is well told by Verner W. Crane of the University of Michigan, in the current number of the *Sewanee review.* It is entitled "A lost utopia of the

first American frontier." Several other articles of distinct literary merit complete this number.

Transylvania college of Lexington, Kentucky, may be justly proud of its library. In a recent report prepared by the librarian, Mrs. Charles F. Norton, published in the *Lexington Leader*, February 2, 1919, many names well-known to history are cited as having been intimately associated with its growth. When in 1784 the Reverend John Todd of Virginia "presented to the Seminary a Library and Philosophical apparatus," the beginning was made. Since then many donors have generously contributed to the library. Mrs. Norton cites among others the names of Matthew Cary, Rafinesque, Henry Clay, Benjamin Gratz, and Edward Everett. Many old manuscripts, rare books, and folios are in the possession of the library; among the latter is an accession made in 1834, "His Britannic Majesty, William IV" being the donor of eighty-one folios, which include among other items four volumes of the Doomsday book.

Elbert J. Benton in his "The movement for a peace without victory during the civil war" has taken cognizance of the more illusive factors in the contending political forces of the civil war period. He wishes to motivate the attitude "of the hundreds of thousands in the South who supported the Confederate cause and of an astonishingly large number in the North who opposed the Unionists in the prosecution of the war without, in either case, having any direct interest in preserving slavery." Mr. Benton's study is based chiefly on contemporary material, although he is often reënforced in his conclusions by standard secondary authorities. It appears in the *Collections of the Western Reserve historical society.*

Interesting because so little has been done in this field is George R. Wilson's "Early Indiana trails and surveys." The author has brought together much material that would at first glance be thought irreconcilable; the subject matter is treated from the point of view of the surveyor as well as that of the historian. It is the third number of volume 6 of the *Indiana historical society publications.*

"Minutes of the society, 1886-1918" has been issued as a number of the *Indiana historical society publications.*

The *Indiana magazine of history* in its March, 1919, number has an article on "The old Chicago trail and the old Chicago road," by Elmore Barce. "The populist party in Indiana," by Ernest D. Stewart, is concluded in the same issue.

The Indiana state library has issued a "List of references on reconstruction," which is a brief topical bibliography of books and articles

covering such topics as "Rehabilitation," "Americanization," "Renaissance in religion," "Public health," and similar questions.

At a meeting of the Michigan historical commission held July 2, 1918, C. M. Burton, city historian of Detroit, was elected president, and William L. Jenks was chosen vice-president, for the year 1918-1919.

"Claude Jean Allouez, S. J.," is an interesting study of Father Allouez, by John A. Lemmer, in the *Michigan history magazine* for October, 1918. Father Allouez is one of a number of Jesuit priests whose heroism, fortitude, piety, and daring enrich the annals of early explorations in the Mississippi valley and lake region.

Ernest Alanson Balch, of the department of history in Kalamazoo college, served until shortly before the armistice in the "zone d'Armee," with the French soldiers. With the rapid demobilization of the French army after the armistice, the need for workers there decreased, and Mr. Balch secured a transfer to the American army. He has since been located at Nice and Cannes, where rest camps for American soldiers are situated.

Francis Parkman's pen, which casts a magic glow over every subject with which he dealt, has made the "Oregon trail" a name suggestive of the romance of the trail-blazer; Jonathan Truman Dorris has made of it a master's thesis. (University of Wisconsin, 1918; reprinted in the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society,* January, 1918). Covering in a somewhat sketchy manner the history of the Oregon country down to 1842, the author proceeds to a detailed geographic analysis of the subject: "The trail to south Pass" and "South Pass to the Willamette valley." "Government aid and protection" are then taken up. Well-known facts are cited to show Jefferson's interest in the Louisiana purchase and the Lewis and Clark expedition, as well as the exploration of Zebulon M. Pike. The author has seemingly made conscientious use of the available printed material, as well as of the important secondary sources, but from the literary point of view the thesis seems weak. The story limps; the language is laborious. The emigrants moved westward, the author says, from "several points of advantage"; they "endured many hardships on the way, some of which were due to their own carelessness. The Indians stole their cattle and shot poisoned arrows from behind rocks at them." Wherever the emigrants are allowed to speak for themselves, however, the narrative gains greatly in interest.

Representative letters from Wisconsin men and women in the game "over there," portraying in vivid flashes some of the many-sided impressions of the war, are found in the *Wisconsin magazine of history* for

March, 1919, in an article entitled "Badgers in the great adventure." It is to be hoped that serious effort will be made on the part of all historical agencies to urge the preservation of such letters, which will in the future constitute important source material in the interpretation of the war. Louise Phelps Kellogg has begun the publication of "The story of Wisconsin, 1634-1848" in the same issue; the first chapter is entitled "Physical and political geography."

"To summarize the settlement of Iowa between the years 1833 and 1860," is the announced purpose of Cardinal Goodwin in his discussion of the "American occupation of Iowa" which appears in the January number of the *Iowa journal of history and politics*. An extensive study entitled "The speaker of the house of representatives in Iowa," by Cyril B. Upham completes the issue.

The State historical society of Missouri has made notable progress during the past year in the matter of book accessions. Among the late additions to the library is the General Oden Guitar collection, including many pamphlets, manuscripts, and sixteen old Missouri political broadsides.

John Barber White, president of the Missouri valley historical society, has contributed an article to the *Missouri historical review* for January, 1919, entitled "The Missouri merchant one hundred years ago." The author makes frequent use of Louis Houck's *Spanish régime in Missouri* and of Scharf's *History of St. Louis*. The significance of the article lies in the fact that Mr. White reveals a veritable mine of historical material but little of which has been exploited. Many names prominently associated with early American history are mentioned in the article as having been intimately connected with the early days of Missouri. It is interesting to note that John James Audubon, the naturalist, was at one time a merchant at Ste. Genevieve on the Mississippi river. A doctor's dissertation might well be written on Mr. White's subject.

For the January number of the *Bulletin of the First district normal school* (Kirksville, Missouri), E. M. Violette has prepared a syllabus of mediæval and modern history. Mr. Violette has throughout treated his subject with simplicity. His analysis of the subject matter follows topical, rather than chronological or national lines. One might question however, Mr. Violette's distribution of emphasis. For example: but one lesson is assigned to "Mediæval revival of learning," and "The growth of national institutions in England from 1215 to 1350;" while the subject of "Mediæval cathedrals" is covered in three lessons, and

the "Catholic reformation" is discussed in two. "Mediæval heresy and friars," and "Louis XIV" are each covered in one lesson.

Aside from this fact, however, Mr. Violette is to be greatly commended for his originality of treatment, his well-chosen topics for discussion which are included under each lesson, and for his choice of "optional reading" material.

The Historical society of East and West Baton Rouge celebrated on March 14, 1919, its third anniversary. Officers for the ensuing year were elected as follows: Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., president; Mrs. L. U. Babin, vice-president; and H. L. Garrett, secretary-treasurer.

Mr. A. C. Holt of Tusculum college, Greenville, Tennessee, will direct the courses in history at the Louisiana state university this summer; while Mr. Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., of Louisiana state university, will conduct the history courses at Peabody college.

The second chapter of the story of "The first Europeans in Texas, 1528-1536," by Harbert Davenport and Joseph K. Wells, appears in the January number of the *Southwestern historical quarterly*. It is, in fact, a descriptive itinerary of Cabeza de Vaca. A detailed map showing the route of Cabeza de Vaca's party, 1528-1536, is appended.

William Campbell Binkley contributes a paper to the *Quarterly* on "The last stage of Texan military operations against Mexico, 1844." It is a very able exposition forming part of a master's thesis written in the seminar of Mr. Herbert E. Bolton, at the University of California.

Mr. T. N. Farris, formerly of Southwestern university, Georgetown, Texas, has been appointed assistant professor of history and economics at Louisiana state university.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. VI, No. 2 SEPTEMBER, 1919

WESTERN TRAVEL, 1800-1820[1]

Civilization is the product of many factors. Just as the mighty river which flows onward to the sea is composed of mingled waters borne by tributaries coming from many sources, so the flood of civilization is but a mingling of many elements, the resultant of many forces. Current and countercurrent have mingled and intermingled, have risen and fallen, have blended together, now in confusion and now in harmony, until in our contemplation of the finished whole the total influence and impress of any one element is scarcely discernible. Yet through all this seeming chaos there is usually some force or element stronger than the rest, which, though perhaps working quietly as an undercurrent and so scarcely noticed, determines the direction and general character of the whole. The expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race in the last three hundred years has been one of the most striking phenomena in modern history; and one of the most dominant, significant, and constructive acts of the American people, which is a phase of the movement, has been their expansion across the continent. During a little more than a century, with resistless energy and laudable spirit they secured, occupied, and developed a vast territory and in so doing established and clearly exemplified America's most characteristic and permanent ideals.

In 1790 the center of population was in eastern Maryland, in 1800 it was just north of Washington, by 1820 it had moved to West Virginia, in 1860 it was far into Ohio. With comparative steadiness, and in a line almost due west from Washington, this

[1] This paper was delivered as the presidential address at the twelfth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Louis, May 8, 1919.

interesting point moved at an approximate rate of five miles a year into the heart of the American continent. The greater part of a movement which the most farsighted of the generation of the constitution had declared would not be consummated for centuries was finished by the sons and grandsons of the men who had fought the revolutionary war. The United States, a nation but newly made from a group of colonies, seems to have instinctively turned its energies into the channel of westward expansion, and no national interests, not even the civil war, succeeded in perceptibly or permanently diverting the attention of its people from the attractions of the west. The westward movement has been a vast accomplishment; it has taken toil and sweat and blood, and the wonder of it is that so great a task could be accomplished, with comparatively little recruiting from the immigrant classes, without devitalizing a nation as thinly populated as was the United States in the last century.

There were three aspects of the movement which were especially important in determining its results. In the first place, it stimulated the spirit of American democracy. All distinctions and demarcations between men were left behind. The west had no time nor material to build a complex social system, and men met each other with great frankness and an entire absence of formality. Secondly, the army which marched into the west was recruited by natural selection and contained the most hardy, adventurous, energetic, and self-reliant men. To the spirit of these men are due the optimistic, progressive, and radical characteristics of the west. Finally, until 1830 the movement was almost entirely Anglo-American, and thus the institutions of the English-speaking people were firmly established in the west before the great influx of European immigration.

Generally speaking, the economic advantages offered by the new territory were the chief causes of the westward movement. This migration of population was not due to religious oppression, political discontent, or social pressure, but rather to a desire to improve material conditions. The trappers and traders, whose occupations led them into the unsettled regions, were the first to move west; then came the squatter, then the more thorough farmer, and in his wake all sorts of business enterprises to

cater to his needs in the lines of commerce and transportation.

The westward movement is really as old as the history of the American colonies, for in them it had its beginnings. Because the colonies themselves were none too firmly established and needed all available energy to found their new civilization, and because of the forbidding aspect of the American forest and the still more threatening American Indian, it was only the hardy frontiersmen who went into the west, even after all French and English claims were removed. These men could scarcely be called agents of civilization; they rather took up the life of the Indian and, though not positively hostile, they did not invite neighbors, seeking to maintain the wildness of the west because it suited their inclinations and fancies and afforded them a livelihood. By the first government census, taken in 1790, it was estimated that five per cent of the total population lived west of the mountain ranges which lie in the Atlantic states. Boone in Kentucky, Robertson in Tennessee, and other pioneers acting on their own initiative had penetrated into the then far west, and other settlements had been made just across the mountains, but the great movement was not fully started before the establishment of the constitution.

The occupation of the lands west of the Appalachians by the American people is an important phase of the world-wide expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race. The Indian and the trapper, the pioneer, the agriculturist and the civilian — such has been the order in the procession to the west.[2] The frontier was the land of romance and adventure which lay between savagery and civilization. There the pioneer hewed the timbers for his cabin and on the clearing planted his first crop. But a more cultured society soon came knocking at his door, urging him to move once more into the wilderness.[3]

Before the revolutionary war was ended, settlers were pouring into the Ohio valley. Kentucky was ready for statehood in 1792, Tennessee four years later, and Ohio in 1802. The purchase of Louisiana attracted attention to the territory near the mouth of the Mississippi, and in 1812 Louisiana was admitted

[2] Frederick J. Turner, *Rise of the new west, 1819-1829* (*The American nation: a history*, v. 14 — New York, 1906), 84 ff.

[3] William S. Bryan, "Daniel Boone," in *Missouri historical review*, 3: 94.

to the union. By that year, too, settlers were taking up lands in Missouri.

When the eighteenth century drew to its close, the wilderness beyond the Mississippi had been completely circumnavigated; ships had passed along the Pacific coast and trappers had penetrated here and there from the east. Two and a half centuries had elapsed since Coronado made his famous journey; Juan d'Escalante had made his way north almost to Salt lake, and Alexander McKenzie had crossed the continent to the Pacific ocean on the north.

In 1792, Captain Gray, commanding the ship *Columbia* of Boston, discovered in latitude 46° 19′ north the entrance of a bay into which flowed a fresh-water river. He went up this river some eighteen miles, made maps and descriptions of it, and traded with the Indians. Soon after, when putting out to sea, he met Captain Vancouver, who was cruising by order of the British government. He told Vancouver of his discovery and gave him his maps. Vancouver sent a boat one hundred and fifty miles up the river, took possession of it in the name of his Britannic Majesty, and named it Columbia.

The discovery of this river by Gray awakened but little thought in the American mind, because as yet Louisiana had not been acquired, nor even the coast of Mexico, an object of much more interest at that time than the coast of the Pacific.

With the beginning of the nineteenth century, events were to occur that would affect this wilderness more than the discovery of an important river. Spain in 1800 secretly transferred to France the great unexplored region of Louisiana; in 1803, France sold it to the United States. Its boundary was unknown, and the mouth of the Mississippi was the only point of interest. The wilderness was still the wilderness and little thought was given to its possibilities.

President Jefferson, however, was anxious to have this territory explored and to ascertain whether the Columbia, the Oregon, the Colorado, or any other river offered a direct communication across the continent for purposes of commerce. His suggestions being approved, the American government in 1803 commissioned Captain Meriwether Lewis and Captain William Clark, with about thirty men, to undertake an overland journey

to the mouth of the Columbia. The report of their expedition which they made to the United States government created a lively sensation and quickened the growing impulse on the part of Americans to investigate the great wild realm of the west.

During the Spanish régime in upper Louisiana there would seem to have been no reason why trade between St. Louis and Santa Fe should not have sprung up. But commerce was not developed to any great extent, for there is no record of any expeditions either way during that period.

Up to the time of the transfer of Louisiana to the United States the ports or houses along the Arkansas were for the most part of a temporary character and were established for the fur trade. In 1806 Lieutenant Pike built a temporary redoubt on the south bank of the Arkansas, a little above the mouth of Fountain creek. Pike brought back the first definite information concerning the commercial and political conditions of this Spanish province, and his expeditions unquestionably had a large influence in inducing traders to look in that direction for profitable adventure.[4] For several years after Pike's return, however, there was no attempt to renew trade with Santa Fe;[5] at least no records of such activity have come down to us. The attention of the fur trading coterie was chiefly in the Missouri region.

St. Louis in 1800 was developing from a mere village to a town of importance and some of the characters intimately identified a few years later with the development of the region were there already, notably Manuel Lisa.[6] In 1807 Christian Schultz stated that St. Louis had two hundred houses; Ashe, who was there two years before, said that there were three hundred. The inhabitants were chiefly French. The banks of the Mississippi were not thickly populated—between St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve, a distance of fifty-four miles, Schultz found but one soli-

[4] Hiram H. Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west, a history of the pioneer trading posts and early fur companies of the Missouri valley and the Rocky mountains and of the overland commerce with Santa Fe* (New York, 1902), 2: 495.

[5] *Ibid.*, 2: 496.

[6] Frederick S. Dellenbaugh, *Breaking the wilderness; the story of the conquest of the far west, from the wanderings of Cabeza de Vaca, to the first descent of the Colorado by Powell, and the completion of the Union Pacific railway, with particular account of the exploits of the trappers and traders* (New York, 1905), 151.

tary cabin[7]—but considerable settlement had been made for some hundred miles along the Missouri.[8] St. Charles was a small town consisting of nearly one hundred wooden houses with about four hundred and fifty inhabitants, chiefly descendants of Canadian French. The last establishment of whites on the Missouri was La Charette, sometimes called St. John's.[9] It was a French outpost in the Missouri valley when Lewis and Clark passed through it, and was described by them as being composed of seven small houses and as many poor families.

Aside from these small settlements and various camps of less than a dozen trappers, however, the great region to the northwest was uninhabited. Missouri was then the paradise of the hunter. Wild game existed in numbers almost incredible. Buffalo droves roamed over the plains and Indians hunted across the prairies or lurked along the river courses in search of food.

Between 1807 and 1820 practically all western exploration merely for its own sake was done by individual scientists or fur traders;[10] and the former were dependent on the latter for their opportunity. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that the American people took an active interest in fur trading. Until that time they had not been ready for extensive migration to the west. They were busy with wars and constitution making, and land was cheap and plentiful in the east.

After the war of the revolution the United States looked with sharp disfavor on the British fur hunters who continued to trade within her borders and to tamper with her savages. Of the importance of the fur trade to Great Britain the discussion in parliament in 1783 is a striking proof, for Shelburne, in speaking on the treaty for a northwest boundary, treated the subject almost solely from the point of view of the fur trader. England, being loath to give up her trade, held her settlements and trading posts in the territory of the United States long after she had agreed to quit those domains.

The acquisition of the Louisiana territory in 1803 greatly

[7] Francis A. Sampson, "Glimpses of old Missouri," in *Missouri historical review*, 1: 259.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, edited by Reuben G. Thwaites (Cleveland, 1904), 5: 42.

[10] Isaac J. Cox, *Early exploration of Louisiana* (Cincinnati, 1906), 13.

stimulated interest in the fur trade. The first American fur trading syndicate was the Missouri fur company formed at St. Louis in 1808 by eleven partners. It was under the control of Manuel Lisa, and represented a capital of forty thousand dollars. It was the intention of this company to monopolize the St. Louis fur trade, and its hunters ranged far and wide, penetrating even to the Rocky mountains. Its monopoly, however, was promptly challenged by the American fur company, formed the following year under the proprietorship of John Jacob Astor; it was his plan to establish a line of forts from the Missouri river to the Columbia. Still another important firm entered the lists in 1811, when the American and Michilimakinac companies combined to form the Southwest company; it prepared to exploit the trade of the Mississippi valley and that of all the Indian tribes in the southwest United States. These enterprises and others were of great value in spreading a knowledge of the country and calling the attention of the older states to the value of its resources.

Soon after the acquisition of Louisiana in 1803, St. Louis became the great fur trade center for the United States, just as Montreal was for Canada.[11] By its location the city was accessible and convenient for all traders both as a receiving and as an outfitting station. By 1820, however, it had lost its grip as a fur post because of its civilized growth and Independence, Missouri, became the fur trade nucleus. The actual fur centers, the ones which the trapper and native knew, were the trading posts. And just as it was natural that the explorer should follow and take advantage of the trapper and trader, so it was natural that the immigrant should select a trading post as a site upon which to settle and build a city.

With the explorers are found men like Brackenridge,[12] who went on a trip through idle curiosity with little or no expectation of profit or advantage. Among the scientists were Bradbury,[13] who spent his time collecting and classifying plants; Henry R. Schoolcraft,[14] a competent geologist, who undertook

[11] Washington Irving, *Astoria; or anecdotes of an enterprise beyond the Rocky mountains* (New York, 1849), ch. 14.

[12] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 6: 9 ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, v. 5.

[14] Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Personal memoirs of a residence of thirty years with the*

his expedition to examine the lead mines of Potosi; Thomas Nuttall,[15] who gives us the narrative of a journey "chiefly undertaken for the investigation of the natural history of a region, hitherto unexplored." David Thompson,[16] although a fur trader, was greatly interested in science, and during his extensive travels made meteorological and astronomical observations. The company by whom Thompson was first employed discouraged geographical pursuits; he therefore went over to the North West company as affording more scope for his talents. Thomas Ashe,[17] an Englishman, in 1806 traveled for the purpose of "exploring the Mississippi and other western rivers, and ascertaining the products and conditions of the Country." Like many other travelers, he noticed the fact that the Missouri, rather than the Mississippi, was the principal river and that it was faster flowing and always muddy.

Thus the Louisiana region now became the theatre of American enterprise. Aiding the scientists by lending them the support and means of their expeditions were the American hunters, full of the spirit of wild adventure. They constituted a class different from any other people, leading an exceedingly fascinating life among scenes which were ever changing, following pursuits full of danger, pleasure, and labor, and opening up a network of trails for the oxcart and farmer to follow.

The immigration to Missouri began before the country passed into American hands. Daniel Boone had entered St. Charles county as early as 1795 and had been followed by many Americans.[18] Moses Austin had become interested in the lead mines about Potosi and had founded Herculaneum. The New Madrid, Cape Girardeau, St. Louis, St. Charles, and Ste. Genevieve districts had considerable American populations by 1804. By 1807 salt was being manufactured at Boone's Lick.[19] In 1810 the total population was 20,845.[20] The war of 1812 seriously checked fur-

Indian tribes on the American frontiers: with brief notices of passing events, facts, and opinions, A. D. 1812 to A. D. 1842 (Philadelphia, 1851).

[15] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 13: 25.

[16] *Ibid.*, 6: 253.

[17] Sampson, "Glimpses of old Missouri," in *Missouri historical review*, 1: 257.

[18] Bryan, "Daniel Boone," in *Missouri historical review*, 3: 94 ff.

[19] William F. Switzler, *Illustrated history of Missouri from 1541 to 1877* (St. Louis, 1879), 177 ff.

[20] *Third United States census, 1810* (Washington, 1811).

ther immigration until 1817; but in that year there began a rush of settlers which was destined to continue until Missouri became one of the most populous states of the union.

The chief immigration centers in Missouri were St. Louis, St. Charles, and Ste. Genevieve. The towns swarmed with land agents and speculating companies, urging settlers to take up lands along the Missouri or the Salt river. Before the rush began St. Louis was an unprogressive French town, its only claim to prosperity based on the fur trade, its only excitement the arrival of the traders. By 1820 it contained six hundred houses and American hustle had banished forever the lassitude of creole days.

The direction of settlement was determined mainly by the rivers, the Mississippi, the St. Francis, and, most important of all, the Missouri. The Missouri river bottom lands afforded an easy means of transportation, the only hindrance to the caravans being the numerous streams, which fortunately could be forded with ease. The great rush was to the "Boone's Lick country," a rather vague term that came to be employed to describe all central Missouri. Before 1817 it meant the district about the mouth of Cedar creek, but it was soon extended to Howard, Cooper, and Boone counties.

To reach this land of promise, the settlers either went up the Missouri river by boat or followed the overland trail on the north side of the river to Franklin, Fayette, Rocheport, Columbia, or some other center of settlement in that region.[21] Others ascended the Missouri to the mouth of the Gasconade and then went up that river to lands in Pulaski county. Still others followed the Osage, settling Cole county.

By 1819 the great migration was at its height. By 1820 the settlers had occupied the Missouri river bottoms to within thirty miles of the western border of the state, Ray and Lafayette counties containing the outposts of settlement at that time. Saline and Chariton counties were organized the same year from portions of Howard county. To the east of Boone county settlers had gone into Callaway and Montgomery counties. To the south of the Missouri they had taken up lands in Gasconade and Franklin counties.

[21] James M. Wood, "The settlement of Columbia, Missouri — a type study," in *Missouri historical review*, 3: 170.

A similar movement was going on along the west bank of the Mississippi above St. Charles, following the Salt river and other small streams. Lincoln and Pike counties were organized in 1818 and Ralls county in 1820. In the extreme northeast corner of the state, near the mouth of the Des Moines, settlers had congregated in such numbers that Clark county was organized in 1818. Between the mouths of the Missouri and the Ohio the vacant lands were also being occupied; Jefferson county was organized in 1818, Perry two years later, and Scott in 1821.[22] The St. Francis river valley also attracted many settlers. Wayne and Madison counties were organized in 1818 and St. Francois in 1821.

The total population of the state in 1820 was reported to be 66,586; the settlers were coming in so rapidly, however, that the numbers were no doubt considerably augmented before announced.[23] Of this population 30,000 were distributed along the Missouri river bottom; the Mississippi river regions north of the Missouri contained about 9,000 and the counties south over 20,000; the St. Francis region numbered about 6,000.[24] The population was widely scattered, however, and was nowhere really dense. The greater part of the state contained not over two to six inhabitants to the square mile; Howard, St. Charles, and St. Louis counties were more thickly settled. There were no large cities. Ste. Genevieve was described in 1818 as an antique town with three hundred houses, the chief mart of the lead mines; Cape Girardeau had about fifty habitations, Herculaneum contained thirty or forty buildings. Franklin was laid out in 1816 and Booneville the following year. Columbia was first settled about 1815; the town of Osage was laid off in 1819. St. Louis was incorporated as a city in 1822, with a population of 4,800.[25]

The pioneers preferred to settle in the country rather than in towns. They usually selected a high place near a stream and if possible in the edge of the timber near a tract of fertile

[22] Switzler, *Illustrated history of Missouri from 1541 to 1877*, 495.

[23] *Fourth United States census, 1820* (Washington, 1821).

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] Switzler, *Illustrated history of Missouri from 1541 to 1877*, 215.

land.[26] A spring frequently determined the place of abode. A settler often went long distances into the wilderness before finding a spot to his liking. "To fix an hundred miles from another settler," writes Flint, "was deemed no inconvenience." Even the long-inhabited districts near the mouth of the Missouri were sparsely settled. In 1818 Schoolcraft walked from Herculaneum to St. Louis. He says, "Our road lay over gentle hills, in a state of nature. The grass had but a few places been disturbed by the plough, or the trees by the axe."[27]

During the period under consideration, exploration and travel were directed to the northwest and southwest from St. Louis; the work of a number of the more important traders and explorers to the northwest between 1800 and 1820 serve to give some idea of the labors accomplished.

Manuel Lisa was one of the most remarkable figures in the early history of the Missouri fur trade.[28] He was born of Spanish parents in New Orleans in 1772, and came to St. Louis probably about 1790. By the beginning of the nineteenth century his energy and ability had secured him an important place in the fur trade; about 1800 he obtained a permit for monopolizing the trade upon the Osage river. His original scheme was to form a large depot among the Osage Indians and at the proper time to push on to Santa Fe.[29] Nothing more, however, was ever heard of the venture. In 1806 he organized the Missouri fur company and the following year went to the Three Forks of the Missouri, where he built a fort. Almost every year thereafter, until his death in 1820, he made an expedition up the river.[30]

During the war of 1812, his influence with the Indians was exerted on behalf of the United States government and was powerful in protecting the western settlements.[31] There was no one better acquainted with the Indian character and trade.

[26] Timothy Flint, *History and geography of the Mississippi valley* (Cincinnati, 1832), 1: 186 ff.

[27] Schoolcraft, *Personal memoirs of a residence of thirty years with the Indian tribes on the American frontiers*, 33.

[28] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 5: 97.

[29] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 2: 493.

[30] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 5: 97.

[31] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 1: 125 ff.

That there were no serious outbreaks among the Missouri Indians must be attributed to Manuel Lisa's knowledge of the red men and his loyalty to the United States government.[32] He took an active part in keeping the Missouri tribes at peace and to the end of the war the Missouri Indians were friends of the United States. When peace was declared Lisa had allied with him forty tribes, who were ready to strike the Indians of the upper Missouri if any move was made on their part against the Americans.[33]

John Colter (or Coalter) was a Virginian by birth.[34] He moved to Marysville, Kentucky, where he joined the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1803. On the return journey Colter was discharged at his own request near Fort Mandan, whence he went back to the wilderness on another trapping expedition. In the spring of 1807, as he was returning to civilization, he met the brigade of the Missouri fur company and was persuaded to accompany them to the waters of the Yellowstone. In the summer of the year he was the first white man to cross what is now Yellowstone national park. In May, 1810, Colter came to St. Louis in a small canoe from the headwaters of the Missouri, a distance of three thousand miles, in thirty days. He told of seeing an abundance of beaver. He had remained at the headwaters with a man named Dixon, who had traversed the immense tract of country from St. Louis to the headwaters of the Missouri alone. There he left Dixon and trapped in company with a man named Potts. They met with Indians and Potts was shot. Colter escaped, and arrived at Lisa's fort after seven days, having subsisted on roots. Bradbury met him on his journey in 1810, and this is the last positive knowledge of him; but the *Missouri Gazette* of December 11, 1813, reports the administration of the estate of a "John Coulter deceased," who may have been the same man.

David Thompson was another interesting and remarkable man of the fur trading coterie.[35] Born in London in 1770, he came to America in 1789 and was employed by the Hudson's

[32] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 2: 558.
[33] *Ibid.*, 2: 556.
[34] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 5: 44 ff.
[35] *Ibid.*, 6: 253.

Bay company. In 1797 he went over to the North West company in order to have more freedom for his scientific investigations. During the winter of 1779-1780 he visited the Mandan Indians on the Missouri, and the following summer he explored the sources of the Mississippi. By 1801 he had pushed his explorations to the foot of the Rocky mountains, where in 1806 he sought for the mouth of the Columbia. During the next four years he collected furs and explored the upper Columbia. Here he built several posts and reaped a rich harvest among tribes hitherto unvisited. He attempted to seize the mouth of the Columbia for the British, but failing to do this he abandoned the upper country in 1812.

Another explorer of this time was Captain William Smith, who was born in Virginia in 1768.[36] He migrated to Boston and in 1790 began his life upon the ocean, in the course of which he made eight voyages around the world. In 1810 he had entered the Columbia river in the *Albátross* and ascended it in a boat as far as Oak Point, where he attempted to form an establishment.

Francis M. Benoit was another prominent fur trader of St. Louis.[37] He was born in Canada in 1768 and came to St. Louis in 1790, and was here occupied with the Indian trade until his death in 1819.

Two other travelers that are mentioned in connection with the Missouri country at this time are Thomas Ashe and Christian Schultz. Ashe was an Englishman who traveled in 1806 "for the purpose of exploring the Mississippi and other western rivers, and ascertaining the products and conditions of the country."[38] In his accounts he described the Osage Indians and the life of the people at Ste. Genevieve, where he says the Spanish were being displaced by the Americans. Christian Schultz reached St. Louis in October, 1807.[39] From him and from Ashe has come a description of the life and conditions of St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve at this time.

For the years between 1809 and 1814 there are full records of the journeys of Bradbury, Brackenridge, Hunt, Lisa, and

[36] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 6: 287.

[37] *Ibid.*, 6: 88. The name is sometimes spelled Benit.

[38] Sampson, "Glimpses of old Missouri," in *Missouri historical review*, 1: 257.

[39] *Ibid.*, 1: 258.

Franchère. These men for the most part were contemporary travelers, yet each was following a different line of interest.

John Bradbury was a naturalist.[40] He was born in Scotland but lived for a long time in England and was commissioned in 1809 by the Liverpool botanical society to make researches on plant life in the United States. He arrived during the summer and, acting on the advice of Thomas Jefferson, went to St. Louis. He arrived at this frontier town on the last day of the year 1809. The spring and summer of 1810 were spent in short excursions from eighty to one hundred miles in length from St. Louis. Early in the year 1811, he met with the leaders of the overland Astoria expedition, and was invited to accompany them. He went up the Missouri with them about 1800 miles to the Arikara village; from there he accompanied Ramsay Crooks to the fur trading station among the Mandan Indians, which was two hundred miles higher up the river. When he returned to the Arikara he found the "Astorians" preparing to go overland to the Pacific coast. Their company had been overtaken by the Missouri fur company under the leadership of Lisa, with whom was the adventurer Henry M. Brackenridge. The Missouri fur company, having completed its trade with the Indians, was going to return immediately and Bradbury decided to return with it. They started downstream from the Arikara on July 17, and reached St. Louis in less than two weeks. Manuel Lisa promised to allow Bradbury to land at different places to collect specimens of plants but later refused this permission, much to Bradbury's chagrin.

A detailed account of this journey of the Missouri fur company was made by Henry Brackenridge, whom Bradbury described as an "amiable and interesting young man." Brackenridge was a traveler, author, statesman, and jurist.[41] He was born at Pittsburgh in 1786, and was admitted to the bar before he reached his majority. He drifted to St. Louis and in 1811 joined Lisa's party, chiefly through idle curiosity and in the spirit of adventure. Lisa's expedition left the settlement of St. Louis April 2, 1811, three weeks after that of the Astor company under Wilson Hunt, which was accompanied by Brad-

[40] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, v. 5.
[41] *Ibid.*, 6: 9 ff.

bury. Lisa's barge was manned by twenty stout oarsmen; with the leaders and Brackenridge there were twenty-five men in all. In this expedition Lisa followed the Hunt party up the Missouri and endeavored to overtake it in order that the forces of the two parties might be joined against the hostile Sioux. Lisa overtook the Hunt party on June 4, nearly 1300 miles above the mouth of the river; the two forces together now numbered some ninety men. But Brackenridge was already weary of the wilderness and wished to return to civilization; accordingly he and Bradbury returned to St. Louis together.

Hunt, being in need of horses, purchased several from Lisa, who had a number for the company at the Mandan fort. Lisa left some of his men to trade with the Arikara, while he took a party overland to the Mandan village for the horses. It was the intention of Lisa to proceed to the cataracts of the Missouri for the purpose of attempting a treaty with the Blackfoot Indians. Instead of going to the rapids, however, he returned to the Arikara village to await Henry, who, he meanwhile learned from Benoit, was over the mountains in a distressed situation, and who had sent word by Benoit that he would return to the Mandan village in the spring with his whole party.

Henry had been one of the expedition of the Missouri fur company in 1806, but finding the situation with the Blackfoot Indians precarious, he crossed the Rocky mountains and established himself on a branch of the Columbia. In the meantime the establishment of the company among the Sioux had burned and the firm was practically ruined. The company did not know what had become of Henry. In 1811 they tried to retrieve their losses and to find him; for this reason Lisa's expedition was sent out. As he had planned, Henry reached the Arikara village and rejoined Lisa there; both then returned to St. Louis in October, 1811.

The leader of the Astor expedition of which Bradbury was a member was Wilson Hunt, the chief partner of the Pacific fur company. He was a native of New Jersey and came to St. Louis about 1804. He was a man of ability and energy, and is described as a gentleman of the mildest disposition.

Hunt, Crooks, McClellan, McKenzie, Bradbury, and about sixty other men left St. Louis in March, 1811, and arrived at the

Arikara village on June 13. They gave up the idea of following the Lewis and Clark route and commenced to travel overland from this place. The reason for this change of plan was that in May three Kentuckians, Robinson, Hoback, and Reyner, who had been several years hunting in and beyond the Rocky mountains, now came down the river and joined forces with Hunt. There were now in the party five men who had crossed the mountains in various directions and all agreed that the Lewis and Clark route was very far from being the best, and that to the southward, where the headwaters of the Platte and "Roche Jaune" (Yellowstone) rivers rise, there was a route much less difficult. This information induced Hunt to change his plans; instead of ascending the Missouri to the Yellowstone river nearly nineteen hundred miles from the mouth and commencing his journey by land from that place, he now decided to abandon the Missouri at the Arikara, four hundred and fifty miles lower down the river.

Steering a course west-southwest the party passed the small branches of Big river, the little Missouri above its forks, to Big Horn mountain. The distance from the Arikara to this mountain was about four hundred and fifty miles, over an extremely rugged tract. There was a scarcity of water in the region, but buffalo meat was plentiful. The trip to this point had taken twenty-eight days. In the next three days the party crossed the plains of Mad river; this they followed for a number of days, then reaching the bank of the Colorado river, they followed that for three days. On this river they spent a week drying buffalo meat. They then crossed the dividing mountain and pitched their tents on the Hoback fork of Mad river. After eight days more travel, in the course of which they encamped in the vicinity of the establishment made by Henry in the fall of 1810, they were now nine hundred miles from the Missouri, and had traversed this region in fifty-four days.

Here they abandoned their horses, constructed canoes, and descended the Snake river. By the intervention of impassable rapids they were obliged to make portages; finally, reaching the place where the river was confined between precipices, it was found impossible to proceed by water. McKenzie, McClellan, and Reed set out in different directions down the river for the

purpose of finding Indians and buying horses. Crooks with a few men returned to Henry's fort (Hoback fork of Mad river) for those which they had left, while Hunt remained with the main body of men, trapping beaver for their support. After overcoming many difficulties the two parties succeeded in reaching Astoria: McKenzie, McClellan, and Reed in January, and Hunt in February.

Meanwhile three of the five men left with Crooks, afraid of perishing by want, left him in February in quest of Indians and were never heard of again. Crooks followed Hunt's track, but coming to a low prairie, lost the trail and was compelled to spend the remainder of the winter in the mountains, subsisting on beaver, horse meat, and roots. On May 10 he arrived safely at Astoria.

The life of the three Kentuckians who joined Hunt's party en route, John Hoback, Jacob Reyner, and Edward Robinson, was typical of that of many pioneer hunters to whom the claims of the wilderness proved irresistible and fatal. Having accompanied the Astorians overland to the Snake river, they were detached on a hunting expedition October 10, 1811. They did not reach Astoria. The next summer the returning party met them in the wilderness, destitute and starving, having been robbed by the Indians. With fresh supplies they determined to continue hunting and according to the story of Dorian's squaw, they, together with their interpreter, were murdered by Indians during the winter of 1813.

On June 28, 1812, Robert Stewart, one of the partners of the Pacific fur company, with Ramsay Crooks, Robert McClellan, and two Frenchmen, left the Pacific ocean with dispatches for New York. They went up the Columbia about six hundred miles and there met a Joseph Miller on his way to the mouth of the Columbia. He had been robbed by the Indians and was in a state of starvation. The party proceeded without any uncommon accident until they were within about two hundred miles of the Rocky mountains. Here they met with some Crow Indians who stole their horses. They now had a journey of two thousand miles before them, fifteen hundred miles of which was entirely unknown, as they intended to seek out a route considerably south of that of Lewis and Clark. It was impossible

to carry any quantity of provisions and the danger of starvation was imminent. They pursued their route toward the Rocky mountains at the headwaters of the Colorado, then stood their course east-southeast until they struck the headwaters of the Platte river, which they followed to its mouth. From the Oto village to St. Louis they performed their voyage in a canoe. Thus after wandering for nine months in the wilderness they arrived at their destination on May 30, 1813.

Joseph Miller was a well-educated man of a good family in Baltimore.[42] He joined the United States army in 1799; in 1802 he became a lieutenant but resigned his commission in 1805. He drifted to St. Louis and began a career of fur trading, hunting, and trapping. In 1809 he was a member of the Crooks-McClellan party, and with them joined the Astorians. In the autumn of the same year he abandoned the expedition at Fort Henry on the Snake river.

Stewart met Miller on his overland return journey in 1813.[43] He spent the fall and winter trapping and roving over the country. He was picked up by Stewart's party and acted as their guide from the Snake to the Bear river. For this very excellent service he was taken to task by the rest of the party, who thought that he was leading them too far south; they accordingly abandoned his guidance and made a detour to the north. Miller's course was exactly right and to him belongs the credit of opening that part of the Oregon trail which lay between the Snake and Bear rivers.

David Stuart in October, 1811, established Fort Okanogan on the east bank of the river of that name, just above its entrance into the Columbia; it soon became the chief interior post of the Pacific fur company. Stuart made several trips thither, and explored the river beyond. Upon the sale of Astoria, Fort Okanogan likewise passed into the hand of the North West company, who found this post so profitable that they made it the chief deposit station for the entire region.

James Bird was another of the individual explorers, a Scotchman by birth. He embarked in the fur trade at Mackinac and

[42] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, 5: 106.

[43] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 3: 907. It is quite possible that Miller may have seen Salt lake in the winter of 1811-1812.

became one of the earliest settlers of Prairie du Chien. During the war of 1812 he adhered to the British interests and at its close continued his trading upon the waters of the Mississippi until his death in 1819. Lewis and Clark met him ascending the Missouri upon their return journey in 1806. He is described as a man of integrity and was much respected throughout the northwest.

Gabriel Franchère, a member of the American fur company who sailed with Astor's seagoing party for the Pacific, left New York on September 6, 1810, and arrived at the mouth of the Columbia the following spring; there he began the construction of Fort Astor.[44] Franchère faithfully narrated the occurrences of the following year until the sale of the entire property to the rival North West company in 1813. After this event Franchère returned to Montreal at the first opportunity. He left the Columbia April 4, 1814, and after a difficult and perilous trip across the continent by way of the Rocky mountains and the rivers of the interior, he reached his father's home in Canada in the following spring. It is to Franchère that we owe a detailed account of the conditions of the transfer of the American fur company's post to the North West company.

The war of 1812 brought irretrievable ruin to the American interests on the Pacific and to the fur trade. Its effect on the Missouri trade was to curtail its volume in a large degree, both by diminishing the territory in which it was carried on and by causing a fall in prices owing to the uncertainty of the traffic. Further, it caused unrest among the Indian tribes and the frontier settlements were in danger of Indian war. That more trouble was not experienced with the Indians was due almost entirely to the influence of Manuel Lisa, as has already been noted.

Between 1814 and 1820 there are few if any records of exploration on the Missouri. This no doubt was due to the curtailing of the fur trade in this region. One traveler, however, is recorded at this time—Henry R. Schoolcraft.[45] He was a

[44] *Early western travels, 1748-1846,* 6: 13.

[45] Sampson, "Glimpses of old Missouri," in *Missouri historical review,* 1: 262; Schoolcraft, *Personal memoirs of a residence of thirty years with the Indian tribes on the American frontiers.*

competent geologist who visited the Missouri in 1818 and 1819 and recorded his observations in several publications. He commenced his story at Potosi, which he states was the last village of white inhabitants between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean.[46]

After examining the lead mines of Potosi, he commenced his journey southward with one companion and a horse to carry their effects. They passed to the Osage fork of the Merimac, through the village of the Delaware Indians. After much privation and suffering they finally reached the Arkansas on the White river, and then turned back into Missouri. In what is now Taney county they found two families that had lately arrived and had not yet completed their cabin; here they remained twelve days, and were then accompanied by the two hunters to a point a few miles south of the present site of Springfield. From this point they returned to the White river, descended it for some distance, and returned to Potosi by a route farther east than the one by which they traveled out.

Although for the time being the fur trade and further exploration of the Missouri region were checked as a result of the war, the travelers previous to this time had done much to open up the way for those who came after. From the information which they gave, it appeared that a journey across the continent of North America might be performed with a wagon, there being no obstruction in the whole way, especially along the route taken by Joseph Miller, the most direct from the Missouri to the Columbia river. The returning members of the Hunt expedition reported that any future party who might undertake this journey and who were tolerably well acquainted with the different places where it would be necessary to lay up small stocks of provisions would not be impeded and in all probability would not meet with an Indian to interrupt their progress; on the other route farther to the north, on the contrary, there were almost insurmountable barriers.

Meanwhile the great territory in the southwest had not been wholly neglected. In the spring of 1804, William Morrison of Kaskaskia, Illinois, sent one Baptiste LaLande, a French creole, to find his way to Santa Fe and to carry thither a small assort-

[46] This statement, however, was hardly correct.

ment of goods with a view to ascertaining what kind of a market was there. He probably reached Santa Fe in the summer or fall of 1804, as he told Pike in March, 1807, that he had been there nearly three years.[47]

The goods which he took with him found a ready market, but instead of returning LaLande decided to remain at Santa Fe. This was probably due to several reasons: the long distance, his dread of the desert and the danger from many hundreds of savages, and the offer by the government of land. Doubtless the government preferred that he should stay rather than return with reports which would inevitably lead to a renewal of the enterprise. Furthermore, he had appropriated his employer's money.

The next year, June, 1805, James Purcell, a native of Bardstown, Kentucky, arrived at Santa Fe.[48] In 1802 he and two companions had left St. Louis to hunt among the Osage Indians; when about to depart by way of the Arkansas river for New Orleans, they had been robbed of their furs by a band of Kansas Indians and they now undertook to reach St. Louis. On the Missouri near the mouth of the Kansas river they met a trader on his way up the river to the Mandan Indians, and Purcell joined his expedition. From there Purcell was dispatched to the northwest to trade with the Indians in the valley of the Platte. In the spring of 1805, the Indians with whom he was wandering were driven into the region where the South Platte finds its source. The Indians, who knew that they were not far from the Spanish settlement, sent Purcell to get permission to come in and trade. He arrived in June, 1805, and liked the situation so well that he did not return to the Indians. He remained in Santa Fe for many years thereafter, pursuing his trade of carpenter.

In 1806 there was being organized at St. Louis by a prominent trader a project for trade with Santa Fe. The scheme was to form a large depot among the Osages, and then at the proper time to push on with an escort of friendly Indians to within three or four days' travel of the Spanish settlements. Nothing more was ever heard of the venture, and it is known only through

[47] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 2: 491.

[48] *Ibid.*, 2: 486. Purcell was the discoverer of gold in the mountains of Colorado.

a letter of introduction from General Wilkinson to Lieutenant Pike, dated August 6, 1806. In this letter Wilkinson takes strong ground against the enterprise and urges Pike to do all in his power to frustrate it. The name of the trader was not mentioned but there is every reason to believe that it was Manuel Lisa.[49]

The next expedition to Santa Fe, so far as is known, occurred in 1815-1817.[50] In the summer of 1815 Auguste Chouteau and Julius de Munn of St. Louis formed a partnership for the purpose of trading on the upper Arkansas. They left St. Louis on September 10 in company with a man named Phillebert, who had gone to the mountains the year before and who had come back to get a supply of goods to enable him to buy horses to bring in his furs. Phillebert had selected a place on a branch of the Arkansas as a rendezvous for his men, but when his party arrived there December 8, 1815, they learned from some Indians that the men, despairing of Phillebert's return and being destitute of necessities, had taken everything with them and had gone over to the Spaniards. De Munn went after them and found the men at Taos, and upon going to Santa Fe to see the governor he was himself very well received at the capital. This favorable reception induced De Munn to seek permission to trap on the headwaters of the Rio Grande. He returned to St. Louis for more supplies and arrived there in February, 1816. The following July he returned to the mouth of the Kansas river where he met Chouteau. De Munn again attempted to secure permission from the Spanish government to hunt and again was doomed to disappointment. He then returned with his men to the headwaters of the Arkansas and there remained during the fall and winter.

In the spring he again made a trip to Taos, but found things most unfavorable. He was escorted back by two hundred armed men who were ordered to cause all caches to be raised, and to conduct the traders a distance down the Arkansas and then let them go back to St. Louis. After much negotiation it was finally agreed to allow the party to remain on the north side of the river. This treatment of Chouteau and De Munn seems to have

[49] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 2: 493.
[50] *Ibid.*, 2: 497.

deterred further adventure in the southwest until the overthrow of the Spanish power in Mexico in 1821.

In 1812 Captain Becknell, who had been on a trading expedition to the country of the Comanche Indians in the summer of 1811 and had done remarkably well, determined the next season to change his objective point to Santa Fe. When at or near the caches on the Arkansas, he left the stream and took his party across on the Cimarron or dry route, but they were obliged to return. They then followed up the Arkansas route to Taos.

In November, 1809, three men by the names of Smith, McClanaham, and Patterson, under the guidance of a Spaniard, Manuel Blanco, left St. Louis for Santa Fe, but nothing further was heard of them.

In 1812 another expedition, composed of twelve men under the leadership of Robert McKnight and James Baird, was induced to take a journey to Mexico because they thought that the Spanish authority had been overthrown in Mexico by the revolution of the chief Hidalgo and that the prohibition of foreign trade had been removed. Their hopes were doomed to failure, because just the reverse had taken place. These traders were seized immediately upon their arrival and put into prison, where they remained for nine years before they were given their liberty. John McKnight, a brother of the trader, went to New Mexico to find his brother in 1821 and both returned with several other traders in 1822. Baird also returned in 1822. Chambers, another member of the expedition, made his way down the Canadian river in the fall of 1821.

The expedition of which we have the most detailed account is that of Thomas Nuttall.[51] He was a Yorkshireman who emigrated to Philadelphia as a journeyman printer. He was persuaded by Dr. N. S. Burton to devote himself to science and in the pursuit of this interest he made extensive journeys into the interior of the west. He undertook this particular journey chiefly for the investigation of natural history. He traveled extensively through the region of Arkansas, the Indian territory, Kansas, and Missouri during the year 1819, and although the road traveled by him was not a new one, yet his faithful recording of the impressions which he received constitute a most

[51] *Early western travels, 1748-1846*, v. 13.

valuable detailed description of the geography and the flora of this region.

It is significant to note that all the explorers sent out into the west by the government followed the paths of the fur traders and were guided by them. Major Long in his report to the government in 1819 speaks in glowing terms of the guidance rendered him by certain members of the Missouri fur company. John C. Frémont, too, in his three expeditions covered the territory well known to the Southwest fur company and its messengers for thirty years, and on two of his expeditions had as a personal counsel and guide Kit Carson, who was more conversant with the southwest territory than any other fur trader.[52] This fact by no means detracts from the credit that is due to the government explorers for the services they have rendered posterity in marking out the best routes of travel. They accomplished an admirable work. It was the combination of the knowledge of the traders and the maps of the explorers that aided the emigrant in the great movement toward the west.

Trading posts scattered along the banks of the water routes made it possible for the emigrant to advance by easy stages. It was over the plains and desert country that the early settlers encountered most of their difficulties in their journey westward, for in that portion of the country game was scarce and consequently the trapper had not lingered.

The fur trader was the man who first braved the dangers of the forest, who first opened up the water systems, and whose knowledge of the western territory made exploration possible. He accomplished this work half a century before the government followed him, and perhaps a whole century before exploration otherwise would have been possible.

The trapper naturally cared little what knowledge he was leaving behind him. It is enough to recognize the fact that his labors bore such valuable fruits. He was the first to give forth the information which made exploration successful. Immigration followed exploration and settlement trailed along close in the wake of immigration.

[52] John C. Frémont, *Memoirs of my life . . . including in the narrative five journeys of western exploration, during the years 1842-4, 1845-6-7, 1848-9, 1853-4. Together with a sketch of the life of Senator Benton, in connection with western expansion* (Chicago, 1887), 74.

Thus is seen the importance of the work accomplished by these individual and unofficial explorers. They led the way at the expense of untold hardships and dangers and opened up new trails. By their too often fatal experiences, and by the comparison of different routes, the easiest and most accessible paths were mapped out for those who were to follow.

Harlow Lindley

Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

THE FRENCH COUNCIL OF COMMERCE IN RELATION TO AMERICAN TRADE[1]

Before attempting to trace the measures of the council of commerce[2] of France in relation to the trade of the French-American colonies, it seems desirable briefly to review the history of the organization of that body. The idea of a council or bureau which should furnish the king with expert advice on matters of trade and commerce was by no means new in 1700. The first body to which the name council may legitimately be attached was created in 1664 by Colbert, who then had the general direction of maritime commerce. Though it seems to have played no rôle, it was not formally abolished during his régime and formed the model for the later permanent body. In 1684 under the direction of Seignelay, to whom Colbert's power over exterior commerce fell after the death of the latter, maritime villages sent two memoirs annually to the council by two deputies of each port. Within a few years Pontchartrain began to come to the fore in his double rôle of controller-general and minister of the marine; but when he became chancellor, just before the close of the century, he divided the duties of marine and finance between his son and Chamillart. To the latter was

[1] This paper is a study of the council of commerce of France in relation to the problems of American trade from the time of its organization in 1700 until 1734. It was originally intended to carry the study to 1763, the year which marked the practical loss to France of her colonial empire, but the recent war interrupted such plans. Since the writer was unable to examine the manuscripts personally and found by a careful search through the catalog of the proceedings of the council of commerce and of the bureau of commerce, published by Pierre Bonnassieux, that the records became increasingly scanty after 1734 and would yield very little to alter the conclusions based on the earlier records alone, it has seemed justifiable to limit the study to the years already covered. Final judgments are restricted to the subjects for which these records are conclusive.

[2] The name, council of commerce, is a somewhat arbitrary title, for the body created in 1722 was called bureau of commerce; but inasmuch as the English pamphleteers of the time regularly alluded to the French organization as a council, even after 1722 when it became known as the bureau of commerce, the name, it is believed, will not prove misleading.

assigned the direction of manufactures and commerce, within which were included the colonies and maritime companies. To avoid the disputes which might naturally follow and for the avowed purpose of stimulating that industry and commerce which would promote the welfare of the state, inasmuch as the initiative of individual citizens often conflicted with the larger interests of the nation, a council of commerce was created by order of the council of state on June 29, 1700,[3] similar to that which had functioned thirty years before.

The assembly gathered for its first session on November 29 following at the home of the president, Daguesseau.[4] That gentleman occupied the place of honor at the table; at his right and left were seated Amelot, Chamillart, and Pontchartrain, minister of the marine, with two *maîtres des requêtes* lower down to whom was confided the care of the reports. Twelve deputies from the chief commercial cities of the kingdom were arranged on stools behind the ministers, while two farmers-general of the taxes, when the nature of the discussion required their presence, occupied chairs behind the president. At the foot sat the secretary, whose duties were clerical.[5]

The decree indicated exactly the function of the new council:

[3] This view was voiced by a deputy from Rouen. For the text of the order see Correspondence des contrôleurs généraux, 2: 476. It is possible that this council was patterned after the English board of trade of 1696, as was suggested by the author of *Wisdom and policy of the French* (1755), who felt, however, that the French steadily adhered to the rules of their council whereas the English did not.

[4] Among the commissioners the one who discharged the most important duties was the president. This office belonged to the oldest councillor at the council. Not only did he direct the debate, but during the first third of the century he had administrative functions which ranked him beside the controller of finance and secretary of the marine as a director of the details of commerce. He served, moreover, as intermediary between the council and the ministers. Amelot succeeded Daguesseau; Fagon served from 1726 to 1744, after which the presidency and affairs of commerce were divided never again to be reunited.

[5] The deputies met at his home where he was present without vote. Eugène Lelong, *Conseil de commerce et bureau du commerce: inventaire analytique des procès-verbaux* (Paris, 1900), introduction, xxiv. A catalog of the proceedings of the council of commerce and of the bureau of commerce was prepared by Pierre Bonnassieux under the direction of the ministry of public instruction and fine arts. As Bonnassieux died before he had completed the analytical table and an introduction recounting the history of the councils of commerce in France, the task was carried to completion by a colleague, Eugène Lelong, and the entire work published under the title given above.

it should study all propositions and petitions referred to it in matters concerning commerce and manufactures, in order that the king might base his decisions upon its reports. The government saw the danger of conflict between general and local interests, and so felt it best to reserve the right of control and decision to itself. The council, therefore, had no initiative or power of decision, but as a matter of fact its advice was usually followed. In minor matters the controller wrote his decision to the intendant or asked the latter to render an ordinance himself; but generally regulations took the form of a decree issued by the council of state. The council of commerce was in a way a commission attached to the council of state, where the royal almanac classified it in 1715;[6] by this date it had suffered considerable change in constitution and personnel[7] so that it consisted of seven councillors and six intendants of commerce.[8]

Council and intendants disappeared at the death of Louis XIV. But at the close of 1715, besides the six councils for the conduct of the administration, a new council for commerce was established. This restored body held its first session November 21, 1715,[9] although its official existence became legal only by royal declaration in the following December, while its internal organization was first provided for by an ordinance of January 4, 1716.[10] Under the new arrangement the colonies were placed

[6] This publication classed it among the "Bureaux de Messieurs les commissaires du conseil pour les commissions ordinaires et extraordinaires des finances."

[7] Amelot, who had gone in 1705 as ambassador extraordinary to Spain, was replaced by Daguesseau, too aged by this time to bear easily this increase of duties. Amelot on his return resumed his place.

[8] In 1708 the new controller had created six intendancies of commerce, assigned to six *maîtres des requêtes*, among whom were divided the details of the service. A sixth and seventh commissioner had been added in 1708 and 1715. F 12 54: 215.

The series of registers of the official reports of the meetings of the council, which extends from 1700 to 1791, is composed of forty-nine registers, classified F 12 51-108, not including eight volumes for the years 1700-1719. This series has unfortunately a gap for the years 1767-1782, which it is possible to fill in a certain measure for the years 1769-1777 by means of the minute books, which furnish a summary of each subject; but for the years 1767-1768 and 1778-1782 it has proved impossible to find in any depository either the proceedings or the minutes. Additional copies for certain years have been located elsewhere: ten registers of proceedings for 1700-1719 in the archives of the ministry of foreign affairs, and a copy of the proceedings for 1700-1716 at the chamber of deputies.

[9] F 12 59: 1.

[10] For the whole ordinance see F 12 59: 22 ff.

under the council of marine. The new body consisted of eleven distinguished persons, among whom were to be found the president and chief of the council of finance, the president of marine, five councillors of state, and two *maîtres des requêtes*. The deputies of the principal commercial cities were again given places. The president had the right of entry into the council of regency with the privilege of participation in the discussion of all matters involving commerce. The deputies were thus continued and their advice rendered obligatory. This council, like its predecessors, had no right to make final decisions. Article 3 declared that all matters acted upon in the council should then be taken to the general council of regency to be there definitely decided by the regent.[11] Daguesseau's resignation a few months before his death made Amelot, as dean, president of the new council. By a concentration of offices he became a sort of minister of commerce, although during the first months of the regency the council was frequently presided over by great nobles who had the right of entry. Before Amelot's death on June 21, 1724, a number of changes had occurred.

The creation of a special bureau in this council had protected it against the disorder and anarchy which had swept away most of the other councils by the close of the year 1718.[12] It was able to maintain itself until early June, 1722, when it, too, suffered the fate of the other administrative bodies. It was, however, virtually reëstablished immediately on June 22 with a change of name, bureau of commerce, but with the same character as that of the council of 1700.[13] The new bureau was composed of twenty-two people, among whom were eight councillors, five chosen by the king with a view to their commercial experience. Eight delegates from the merchants of the realm and three representatives of the tax collectors were given places in the bureau. It held its first session July 2 under the presidency of Amelot. Six departments were reëstablished as they had existed in 1715, each including a certain number of provinces. To Amelot fell the direction of commerce and voyages, to the Councillor Le Peletier des Forts that of colonies and fisheries.

11 F 1259: 21.

12 At the beginning of the year Amelot had been given a seat in the council of finance when there were affairs of commerce to discuss.

13 F 1270: 1.

Each head of a department was required to watch and report the condition of his province or the branch of industry belonging to his department and to correspond with the intendant of his province for the execution of royal decisions made on the recommendation of the bureau. Maritime and colonial commerce were not apportioned among the intendants, but still it was from these magistrates that the minister of the marine had to seek advice when he consulted the bureau.

Thus the bureau existed in all its essentials throughout the entire period of the French-American empire — indeed up to the French revolution.[14] The deputies were the most distinctive contribution of the council of 1700. Three deputies had appeared in Colbert's council of 1664; again in 1684 Seignelay had asked all sea merchants to give their opinions concerning important matters of commerce annually through deputies; but the decree of 1700 first made this representation permanent. Men of known probity and commercial experience, elected by the merchants of the chamber of commerce[15] or by the governing municipal body, were chosen: two for Paris, one each for ten maritime cities, Rouen, Bordeaux, Lyon, Marseilles, La Rochelle, Nantes, St. Malo, Lille, Bayonne, and Dunkirk.[16] Elections were at first annual, but later the powers of the deputies were continued from year to year, one deputy sitting for forty-five years.[17] It often proved difficult to find able men, while cities found the burden of the six to ten thousand livres necessary to maintain a deputy suitably at court so heavy a charge that they tried to escape it by neglecting to send a deputy.[18]

The work was purely consultative; the deputy spoke when asked to do so, presented reports, and deliberated in the depu-

[14] During the years 1730-1738 there occurred some modifications in the composition of the elements and some diminution of the importance of the president of the bureau, as his functions and those of the director of commerce were separated at the death of Fagon in May, 1744.

[15] In 1700 but two chambers of commerce existed, but others were promptly formed.

[16] They all appear also in the scheme for the council under the regency.

[17] It appears that one deputy sat forty-five years; four others more than twenty years. It should be noted that three colonies eventually sent deputies: Martinique and St. Domingo in 1761, and Guadeloupe in 1766. F[12] 104: 78. The records show the arrival of a deputy from St. Domingo as late as January 23, 1783. F[12] 106: 8.

[18] F[12] 62: 108.

ties' assembly, which met twice a week with the secretary, to whom were referred affairs from the council or minor matters even before they had reached that body.[19] But the deputies did not scruple to voice their opinions, make suggestions, offer vigorous protests on occasion, and even present business to the council.[20]

References to colonial affairs begin to grow scanty in the proceedings of the bureau after 1730,[21] business consisting largely of matters of routine for the most part uninteresting. The number of sessions of the bureau sank to thirty-five or forty a year. To a belief in strict regulation there succeeded after 1738 more liberal tendencies, which limited the number of affairs over which the administration deliberated. More often matters were handled directly by the president of the council or by the committees of the intendants. *Arrêts* were often passed, of course, by the council of state on matters which did not reach the minor council. Still, the latter had power to suppress the decree of a colony[22] and appeal lay to it in all cases of dispute between merchants and tax collectors. Business could come directly before the council or might be referred to it; this body then in turn often sought information from the deputies on local issues, from the intendants, from the chambers of commerce, from the farmers-general,[23] and even from the merchants.

Certain outlying principles with regard to colonial commerce seem to have been established before the creation of the council, dating back in great part to Colbert's scheme of colonial administration, but in regard to local dues to a much earlier period. The tariff schedule of 1698 determined the duties to a

[19] If a weighty matter was under consideration the secretary referred it to the deputy most conversant with the subject; he brought back his matured judgment to a later meeting, whereupon it was reported back to the council. Unanimous decision was not necessary.

[20] The government tried to make the deputies independent of their electors. It sought to promote a general rather than a local interest in commerce.

[21] For twelve years, from 1749 till 1762, there is evidence in the catalog of eleven references to colonial affairs. In 1758 the sessions were short and irregular and the records of the proceedings are often missing.

[22] As, for instance, the decree of the superior council for Quebec. F 1282: 324.

[23] F 1255: 35. For a fuller treatment of the history of the council of commerce see Lelong, *Conseil de commerce et bureau du commerce*, introduction, vi ff.; A. de Boislisle, *Les conseils du roi sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 1884), 7: appendix, 155 ff., 415 ff.

large extent until superseded by the rule of 1717. Much dissatisfaction with the old regulations and tariffs and many conflicting if not contradictory decrees, giving rise to frequent contests between merchants and tax collectors, led on April 8, 1717, to a significant revision of the law regulating colonial commerce.

The whole was worked over for more than a year with much care and painstaking sifting of information. Deputies of the chief cities engaged in colonial commerce met with the farmers-general at frequent intervals; merchants were summoned before the council and interviewed; measures to favor the colonies were discussed; the conflicting interests of state, colony, tax collector, and port were considered; and effort was made to enable the various cities of the kingdom to compete on equal terms for the commerce of the colonies. While the rupture with the past was not absolute, essential changes were made.[24]

Colonial commerce in the early years of the council was restricted to five ports:[25] Nantes, La Rochelle, which had not yet lost the mercantile preëminence which her Huguenot industry had won for her, Bordeaux, Rouen, and Marseilles.[26] Dunkirk was the first to break into the narrow circle of the elect. Her chamber of commerce demanded, almost immediately after the formation of the council,[27] the right to bring sugars and other necessities for her commerce direct from the West Indies.[28] Her deputy, unwearying in his efforts, secured for her in 1704 the desired entry into the trade, but under rigid conditions of carrying to the colonies only French merchandise.[29] In Janu-

[24] The record of the discussion at the council of July 25, 1726, brings out the above facts. F 12 73: 490.

[25] Constant reference is made to them as the ports of the "cinq grosses fermes." F 12 51: 68. But this term seems to have been used loosely, since it describes one of the three zones created by Colbert in 1664 to simplify the taxes, including the Ile de France with the twelve provinces between the Loire and the Somme. The second zone included the "provinces étrangères": Brittany, Franche Comté, Flanders, Auvergne, and southern France; while the "provinces reputées étrangères" included Marseilles, Dunkirk, Alsace, Lorraine, Metz, Verdun, Lille, and Bayonne.

[26] F 12 51: 234. Note that Marseilles was a free port with the right to colonial trade, possibly because it tapped the most prosperous part of France.

[27] January, 1701.

[28] F 12 51: 19.

[29] This subject does not appear again in the proceedings after June 4, 1704, when the whole matter was reported to the king without formulated decision. F 1251: 262. A later statement, however, shows that the king had granted the request.

ary, 1704, Bayonne was likewise rapping for admission, only to be instantly refused.[30] Persistence, however, eventually broke down the opposition so that some time before February, 1707, the right of participation in colonial trade was hers. By 1716 the whole attitude on this question had become more liberal. The estates of Languedoc on October 15 presented a *cahier* demanding permission for their merchants to trade with the colonies of America through Cette. Again the original ports objected to sharing the gains of trade in time of peace after having sustained alone the losses in time of war. But the council decided that it was not right to refuse this demand, since "all the maritime provinces have a port by which they are permitted to trade with America."[31] And so the grains, wines, and brandy of Languedoc entered the colonial markets on an equality with the cloths of Normandy, with the wines, staves, and hoops of Bordeaux and La Rochelle, with the glass, shoes, and hats of Rouen, and with the oils, dried fruits, and light cloths of Marseilles.

The first article of the rule of 1717 greatly increased the list of cities which might engage in colonial commerce, all seaports of any significance now being admitted — thirteen in all. To the original number were added Calais, Dieppe, Havre, Honfleur, St. Malo, Morlaix, and Brest, while Dunkirk and Marseilles were dropped.[32] But within less than two years — February, 1719 — Marseilles was restored to the list. Dunkirk, after considerable hesitation on the part of her merchants, asked in December, 1717, to be continued in the old right. Three years later the council, moved "by her sad and bitter condition since the demolition of her port and the loss of her colonial trade,"[33] recommended that the king accord her letters patent for this trade under provisions similar to those prescribed in 1717. The favorable situation of another small port of Brittany — on a river with a number of small islands for shelter against storm and pirates — proved decisive and Vannes was added to the

[30] F 12 51: 234.

[31] October, 1716. F 12 59: 196.

[32] The line was closely drawn. Toulon was not allowed to take the place of Marseilles even while that city was debarred from commerce by quarantine.

[33] Dunkirk, it will be recalled, had been demolished under the terms of the treaty of 1714, but Louis had dug another port and canal near the old city.

list.[34] The privilege of participation in the fisheries on the coast of Canada and Isle Royal, with the exemption from export duties granted by the letters patent of 1717, "since they had been made general for the colonies,"[35] was extended to Sable d'Olonne in October, 1728, and to St. Jean de Luz in March, 1734.[36] Although several other ports sought, after these permissions, to gain a share in the American commerce, there is no evidence in the records which would justify the conclusion that the list was further extended.[37] Meanwhile, by December, 1722, certain ports of entry had been designated for each colony of the new world.[38]

Before 1717, according to a decree of the council of state of December 14, 1671, vessels were free to return to any one of the five ports which shared in the colonial trade,[39] though they were required to sail from and to return to one of these ports. But as the lack of uniformity in the rate[40] produced great discrepancies in the taxes, and as this rule gave the ocean ports, moreover, a great advantage over Marseilles, the revision of 1717 required return directly to the port of departure, except in case of shipwreck or other accident.[41] None of the articles had provoked greater discussion when the rule of 1717 was formulated;[42] none was more constantly assailed or more tenaciously

[34] F 1275: 794. The *arrêt* issued from Versailles December, 1728. F 1275: 994.

[35] The council ruled that all subjects without exception who sent cargoes thither should enjoy equal rights. F 12 75: 834 ff. For the full text see F 12 76: 99.

[36] Almost twenty years later, as a concession to the war then in progress, the former city was permitted to share in the commerce of the West Indies for one year, a concession renewed for one additional year. St. Jean de Luz had participated in the trade, but paid duties on exports on the score that it was not named in the letters patent of 1717. In 1734 it appealed to the council with the result shown above. F 12 81: 535, 786.

[37] Granville sought entry in May, 1737, but was refused (F 12 84: 249; 94: 139); Amiens and Abbeville in October, 1744 (F 12 91: 557); Valery in 1740 (F 12 87: 452).

[38] Quebec for New France; Cape François, Leoganne, Petit Goave de Pix, and St. Louis for St. Domingo; St. Pierre, Port Royal, and La Trinité for Martinique; and Basse Terre and Grande Terre for Guadeloupe. Article 2, F 12 70: 266. Article 2 of the rule of 1717, which required return to the port of departure, and article 16, granting storage privileges, were made applicable to islanders with strict precautions against abuse.

[39] Based on a statement in F 12 63: 119.

[40] Stated by Maurepas, F 12 73: 241.

[41] Article 2, F 12 62: 51.

[42] F 12 79: 163.

adhered to. Already on February 12, 1722, temporary permission to deviate from the rule while the subject was being examined was given[43] but the grant was promptly revoked, while in December following the rule was made applicable even to the colonial ports.[44] After repeated efforts St. Malo on July 25, 1726, finally won the privilege of return to a port on the Mediterranean by picturing the advantage to Marseilles herself in quickened trade, especially with Italy, and in the advantage to the customs.[45] But though permission was given in individual cases and though Maurepas still urged freedom of return, it was not until April 20, 1744, that the article was wholly suspended, and then only for the period of the war.[46] In 1748 the council was again reviving the question,[47] so that it is clear that the policy of free return had not yet been fully established.

The principle that vessels should not secure any portion of their cargo at a foreign port en route to or from America, fixed in practice before 1717, was expressly forbidden in 1717 by articles 26 and 27. The first departure from the rule came in February, 1721, when under pressure of a plague at Marseilles ships were allowed temporarily to return via Spain,[48] under restrictions intended to secure the payment of all legitimate duties. Little more than a month later it was extended to permit of return via Genoa, Leghorn, and Naples with exaction only of the *domaine d'occident*[49] and evidence of the character of the produce taken on at the West Indies.[50] Because of the advantage which colonials would have and the opportunity for evasion of the taxes, however, this privilege was refused them the following April. The dispensation lasted a little more than two years, when with the subsidence of the

[43] Coupled with a strict prohibition against regarding the action as a precedent. Merchants had also to agree to pay the fine which the council might later impose.

[44] F 12 70: 197 ff.

[45] F 1273: 498. A state decree followed on September 3. F 1273: 551. In March ships from St. Malo had been allowed to return to any port of Brittany.

[46] The catalog states that the decree is found in F 12 91: 769.

[47] Catalog, F 12 95: 647.

[48] The request of a merchant of Bordeaux to return from Martinique via Cadiz was made the occasion for a general dispensation of the rule.

[49] A tax of three per cent usually levied on goods from the French West Indies.

[50] March 27. F 12 68: 133 ff.

plague the rule again became operative.[51] In January, 1726, frightened by a rumor of the free entry of Brazilian sugar into Spain,[52] the rule was again set aside with respect to refined and muscovado sugar for Spain only.[53] All efforts to secure the extension so as to return via Italy were vain, as was the effort of St. Malo to secure the inclusion of raw sugar, for fear that this article would reach other foreign markets and so cripple the French refineries by putting them at the mercy of carriers.[54] The records do not show revocation of this liberty, but neither is there any evidence of further relaxation.

It was not until December, 1725, that any deviation from the rule of direct passage to the colonies was permitted, and then only as the result of a determination to crush the foreign trade there. It was therefore decided to allow cattle to be taken aboard at the Cape Verde islands, where a dearth of manufacturers seemed to make the venture safe. But since the pressing need of the colonies for food was insufficiently met from this source, the council was obliged within twelve months to permit ships for one year to stop at Irish ports for provisions, especially salt beef, in an effort to silence the clamor for foreign trade. Despite the objections of Bordeaux that her commerce with Ireland had suffered since French vessels had been stopping there for beef, the privilege was continued each year successively until 1741.[55]

Certain principles with regard to duties were clearly established by the time the council took charge of mercantile affairs in 1700. Food of French production could be exported to the colonies free of all export duties;[56] colonial produce intended

[51] June 4. F 12 70: 163.

[52] The quality of the sugar was so superior that there was danger that France would lose out altogether. F 12 72: 49; 73: 17.

[53] For the whole decree see F 12 73: 57 ff., dated January 27. It was not extended to colonials, as, according to Maurepas, it would not be possible to prevent their taking foreign merchandise and supplies back to the isles. F 12 73: 226.

[54] As there were but few refineries in Spain the reason for excepting raw sugar does not appear. One merchant felt that it was but the continuation of the policy of 1698 when there was barely enough sugar for France, but cited the exportation of ten thousand barrels at this time (1727).

[55] The clause in the first permission, "sans esperance d'un plus long terme," becomes amusing in the light of subsequent extensions for fifteen years. The decree was issued December 24. F 12 74: 807.

[56] By 1744 there is evidence that beef was again passing first to France. Catalog,

for foreign consumption was stored duty-free;[57] and in general local dues, except on food, were honored.[58] Goods for the American colonies could be moved without duty from the interior to a port,[59] and from one port to another in case of inability to transport by water. In general, it would seem that colonial produce must pass directly to the French port for which it was declared, though for cause overland transport under the usual three per cent *domaine d'occident* was allowed.[60] The principle of relieving French exports, including munitions and equipment for vessels as well as food, of all duties except aid and *domaine d'occident* was continued by the rule of 1717.[61] The right of transference of French goods intended for the colonies from one point to another suffered a change in that food and merchandise passing by sea from one port to another must be stored, must be declared at the customs, and must prove delivery at the designated port within three months. The right of transport overland with direct transfer to the ship was continued with safeguards against abuse.[62] To insure delivery at the colonial port named, merchants were required to bring back a certificate signed by the governor, intendant, and chief of the *domaine d'occident* bureau.[63]

In December, 1722, the rule of 1717 was extended to the islands, with its obligations of direct return to the port of departure without stopping in either direction at a foreign port and of furnishing evidence of delivery within one year, while the remainder of the articles were extended in a general way.[64]

F 12 91: 306. A few instances of voyages via Spain and the Cape Verde islands, to avoid the long detour to Ireland, are to be found. F 12 74: 530; 81: 932.

57 A principle operative as early as 1671 and confirmed in 1673, 1674, 1677, and 1701. F 12 62: 50.

58 Allowable after August, 1671. F 12 59: 196.

59 See F 12 54: 178 for old duties on hats. Food would seem to have passed out free since 1665. F 12 74: 147.

60 After 1702 by order of the controller-general from one port to another. F 12 58: 293.

61 Such a case arose in 1710 when the presence of corsairs in the Mediterranean offered such risks that the merchants of Bordeaux were allowed to send some sugar by the canal of Languedoc to Marseilles. F 12 55: 180.

62 By constant examination of the seals, by verification of the number of boxes and bales, and by loading aboard ship in the presence of clerks of the customs.

63 Article 9. It implied that certain colonial ports must be designated.

64 F 12 70: 197 ff. In December, 1717, certain of the articles of the rule had been

At first goods which were not to be had in the kingdom could be imported from abroad for the colonial trade under rigid conditions designed to prevent abuse of this effort to favor colonial trade.[65] Beginning in the early years of the century with few requests, the stream of foreign imports swelled to considerable dimensions by 1707,[66] being drawn chiefly from Holland, Ireland, Germany, the Spanish Netherlands, and occasionally from England.[67] It would seem that a list of the foreign products so favored was kept on file at the council.[68] Some articles came in duty-free, some on payment of the customs; but goods procurable in the kingdom were rigorously excluded.[69] In 1717, however, a change occurred in this regard. Foreign goods, even from Marseilles and Dunkirk, were now subject to import duties, even though declared for the islands.[70] The sole exception was Irish salt beef, which could enter the ports named in the first article duty-free if stored.[71] Within a few years, in 1722, the need for foodstuffs became so pressing that the privilege of free

extended to Canada, such as the right of storage for goods to or from New France, and reëxportation to foreign lands, although a decree of December 11 had expressly renewed the exemption which Canada had always enjoyed from the three per cent *domaine d'occident*. Canada still paid duties under the schedule of 1664. F 12 79: 581. In 1732 the council was forced by a refusal of the farmers-general to acknowledge the right of colonials to exemption from export duties to decree that the colonials must be treated just as were Frenchmen. F 12 79: 167.

65 An equivalent cargo must be sent from France, goods must be transferred from ship to ship in the presence of customs officials, or placed in storage under three locks. F 12 55: 125.

66 The writer noted sixty-four such requests acted on separately in a few years.

67 The principle that such goods should enter free had asserted itself in 1673, when a decree of the council of state made all foreign goods for the negro trade exempt from import and export dues. By recommendation of the council the practice was continued in 1700. F 12 51: 7, 251.

68 Based on a statement in F 12 58: 139.

69 F 1254: 389; 55: 26. This was particularly true of cloth. F 1255: 128. The free list included porcelain, white linen, pipes, knives, tin, gunpowder, beads, steel, thread, lace, copper vessels, coarse prints, coral, and pottery from Holland and Germany (F 1254: 284; 55: 108, 181); salt beef, butter, wax, tallow, and candles from Ireland (F 12 55: 34); copper vessels and prints from England; and, rarely, lace, thread, paper, and cloth from Italy (F 12 55: 297). Swedish iron and copper ore were allowed entry but with duty, as were also whale oil, mirrors, locks, and bells. Guns, tarred cordage, cables, woolen goods, and ploughshares were wholly rejected. F 12 55: 60.

70 Article 10, F 12 62: 53.

71 Article 2, F 12 62: 53.

entry and storage was extended to include butter, salt salmon, lard, and bacon, not only from Ireland but also from other countries. Granted for one year only, it proved necessary to extend this privilege each succeeding year until November, 1730, when it was continued for three years and then appeared no more in the records.[72]

The storage of colonial produce without duty, practiced since August, 1761,[73] was continued except for the *domaine d'occident* by the rule of 1717 for all the ports named in article 1, except those of Brittany, if declared at entry for foreign export. Merchants who exported colonial produce by sea must state the destination of the goods and submit within six months evidence of delivery in the designated port.[74] Merchants of ports enjoying the right of export could ship overland by prescribed routes under certain hard and fast conditions[75] the following colonial products: refined and cassonade sugar, indigo, arnotto, ginger, and cocoa.[76]

Decisions of the council soon gave these provisions a more exact interpretation. Only a few months after the promulgation of the new law, August 26, it was ruled that colonial goods for Rouen arriving at Havre or Honfleur could be stored at one of the seaports and that a cargo could be divided for storage purposes. Since the article provoked discussion as to the limit of storage privileges, it was decided in January, 1723, that storage must be limited to one year, the same regulation being applicable to goods for as well as from the colonies.[77] As early as May, 1721, the list of undutiable articles which might enjoy the benefit of transit was extended: furs and Canadian goods, except beaver, were expressly named,[78] while tanned leather, the last to obtain this right, was added in August, 1746.

72 F 1275: 907. It ended presumably August, 1733.

73 F 12 59: 195.

74 By a certificate signed by the French consul, a judge, or other official. Article 16, F 12 62: 54.

75 Particular routes for the various countries are enumerated in article 16 of the rule of 1717. See article 17 for the conditions. F 12 62.

76 A later statement declared the chief purpose of the new schedule was to help raw sugar pass to foreign countries.

77 F 12 70: 109 ff. The rule applied to every port engaged in the trade.

78 The farmers-general had refused this right to Canadian goods, as they were not named in article 17. F 12 62.

As by 1722 the right of storage, despite the vigilance of self-interested officials of the customs, had proved itself susceptible of abuse,[79] the council required within one year after storage in a warehouse an inventory by a clerk of the customs.[80] Likewise the temptation of refiners to declare all sugars for foreign consumption necessitated the requirement of a certificate of delivery within four months after importation[81] and strict observance of the designated routes, while transit by land was by 1737 given a narrow construction.[82]

It is possible to glean some slight conception of the system and amount of duties levied on colonial produce. Until 1717 Colbert's tariff schemes prevailed in general. His underlying principle seems to have been to tax colonial produce for home consumption, but not if it were intended ultimately for foreign exportation. The taxes were, in the main, high, as the necessity for a general rescaling in 1717 shows. As is well known, the chief articles of colonial production at this time were fish, oils, sugars, cocoa, indigo, and beaver skins from Canada.[83] Sugar was the great object of taxation.[84] Under the schedule of June 20, 1698, raw sugar paid an import duty of three livres sixty sous per hundred pounds.[85] Already in December, 1700, the council was discussing the advisability of relaxing the rule which forbade its export, since there seemed more than an ample supply for home refineries. By July, 1715, the merchants of the western ports found their sugar a drug on the market, and hence the council recommended that permission be given La Rochelle and Bordeaux to store raw sugar.[86] In the following

[79] Goods were often sold to a shipper or in small amounts to merchants for France. For cases in point see F 12 54: 284.

[80] F 12 70: 271 ff.

[81] For the seven detailed articles see F 12 77: 61. February 16, 1730.

[82] In connection with an effort by citizens of Nantes to send indigo and other produce from Bordeaux abroad by the canal of Languedoc. F 12 83: 651.

[83] Inasmuch as beavers were handled by a company under a monopoly, this article does not touch that complicated subject.

[84] From 1670 on, France was acquiring supremacy in the fisheries, driving England out; but while she supplied her own market with sugar, it was only in 1715 that she was in a position to export sugar.

[85] The rates mentioned differed until it is difficult to draw conclusions.

[86] To the amount of ten thousand barrels for La Rochelle, six thousand for Bordeaux. Fourteen thousand barrels were reported in the refineries, while eleven thousand barrels a year supplied the demand.

October merchants of Nantes secured permission to export duty-free one-half the raw sugar then on hand or in the warehouses by the close of the year.[87] And so great became the surplus that the right of free export remained effective through repeated renewals until July 1, 1717, when the new rule had gone into effect.[88]

A decree of September 28, 1674, had granted to the four cities of Rouen, Dieppe, Bordeaux, and La Rochelle restitution of duties on sugar after it had been refined, if declared on entry for foreign use. An effort in 1707 to secure an extension of this privilege to Nîmes for Languedoc was refused for fear that it would injure the trade of the maritime cities.[89] In 1711 it became necessary to restrict the time limit within which restitution of duties on sugars could be claimed to six months after they had entered storage and to name the ports by which the refined sugar could be exported.[90]

Modification in duties on colonial products meant for home consumption, however, was made in most cases by the rule of 1717.[91] Thereafter in all ports but those of Brittany a tariff of three livres fifty sous a hundredweight was collected on raw sugar, of two livres ten sous on muscovado,[92] and of eight livres on cassonade.[93] The schedule was also fixed for indigo, ginger,

[87] Soon the other ports were clamoring for like rights under threat of breaking off their colonial commerce. F 12 59: 18.

[88] The usual conditions of a declaration to transport, payment of local dues, and the like, were imposed. F 12 59: 57. An almost prohibitive duty existed on foreign sugars — twenty-two livres ten sous per hundredweight, mentioned incidentally in F 12 51: 6. It was laid by the last tariff before 1700, presumably that of 1698. From this time the advance in the output of sugar was so rapid that according to Joshua Gee, an English merchant, the French were underselling the British on the continent, even acting as carriers of Brazilian sugar to the levant. Charles M. Andrews, "Anglo-French commercial rivalry, 1700-1750: the western phase," in *American historical review*, 20: 550.

[89] F 12 54: 2.

[90] F 12 77: 69. Local dues were not to be escaped, even by petted colonial produce, but the only suggestion of the amount appears in a note of a fifty sous duty on sugar at Rouen and of a duty of one sou per pound on American cod in Norman ports. F 12 55: 166.

[91] As early as 1702 the deputy of La Rochelle complained that duties on colonial produce were too high — more than in foreign lands, especially Holland.

[92] Compare with the three livres twenty sous formerly levied.

[93] Compare with the fifteen livres of the tariff of 1664; note the reduction.

cotton, arnotto, cassava, cocoa, rope yarn, and tortoise shell.[94] Any of the above articles entering Brittany was obliged to pay the stipulated rates before passing into any other province.[95] In view of the moderation in duty on raw sugar, the restitution of entry duties on sugar refined for foreign use was kept at the old rate.[96] In Brittany the old schedule was operative, without restitution of duty on reëxportation or reduction upon entering another province of France. The duties on other colonial products were left unchanged, a fact which meant dues according to Colbert's scale of 1664 in the "cinq grosses fermes" and local dues in the provinces "reputées étrangères."[97] The duty on foreign sugar was everywhere left at the old rate,[98] while the right of storage was revoked except for the muscovado sugars of Brazil and then only in the ports of Bayonne and Marseilles.[99] The *domaine d'occident* duty was declared collectible in all the ports at three per cent in kind or money, even if the produce had been declared for reëxportation.[100]

The new schedule did not seem to require alteration until 1724, when the tariff of 1664 of fifteen livres a hundredweight on refined sugar from the provinces "reputées étrangères" into the "cinq grosses fermes" was felt to be too heavy, as it made Dutch sugar cost less than sugar from Bordeaux.[101] The duties, accordingly, were moderated to three livres, two sous, one denier, with Brittany as usual excepted.[102] The article which prescribed the restitution duties on sugar required further formulation be-

[94] The writer has been unable to find a basis for comparison with former rates on these articles.

[95] Article 20 of the letters patent of 1717. It was reported that merchants of St. Malo were present and agreed to this important article.

[96] Five livres, twelve sous, six deniers, virtually a bounty from the state, a rate fixed in 1684. Article 31 of the letters patent of 1717. Very early Cette was recognized as belonging to the list of cities which might have the import dues restored when the refined product was exported, the omission being merely an oversight. F 12 63: 5.

[97] Except for loaf sugar, taxed even in Brittany two livres ten sous according to the decree of April 25, 1698. Article 23, F 12 62: 57.

[98] See above, note 88.

[99] Article 24 of the letters patent of 1717.

[100] Article 25, F 12 62.

[101] F 12 71: 41.

[102] F 12 71: 213.

fore the problem was settled. The council in October of 1717 agreed on the amount to be restored on sugar refined in France: six livres fifteen sous on all sugar declared prior to August 1, 1717; five livres, twelve sous, six deniers on those declared subsequent to that date.[103] In 1725 it recommended a decree that sugars refined at Bordeaux, Rouen, Dieppe, or La Rochelle from raw colonial sugar, intended for consumption in Alsace or Franche Comté, should continue to enjoy exemption from all import and export duties on raw sugar.[104]

The regulation concerning the *domaine d'occident* called for clarification, as a difference in valuation at various ports created in due time complaint. But in general the council insisted that custom officials should levy the lower valuation in order to help rather than burden colonial commerce.[105] An interpretation of this tax in relation to intercolonial trade also became obligatory when it was ruled that this duty might be collected on goods from the southern colonies to Isle Royal and goods taken in exchange to France. But the exemptions from this tax, granted in 1714 for ten years on dried cod and oils of Isle Royal and on all American produce resulting from the negro trade under the letters patent of the Guinea company of 1716, were held valid.[106]

Though the rules seemed hard and fast, the council allowed from first to last many exceptions. In fact, so numerous were the requests for deviations from the law that they consumed a generous portion of the time of the council. It may not be too much perhaps to interpret the increasing number of such grants after the first quarter of the century as evidence of a growing liberality of policy.[107] Vessels were relieved from the necessity of returning to the port of departure for various reasons, some valid, some mere pretexts.[108] Likewise, exceptions were allowed

[103] F 12 62: 151. See special decree of January 22, 1718.

[104] But not until 1733 did the council define the formalities to be observed by the refiners in order to claim restitution of the duties. F 12 80: 997.

[105] For such a case in 1731, see F 12 78: 417. The colonial trade seemed to be falling off just then.

[106] May, 1731. F 12 78: 417.

[107] A hasty count revealed twenty-four such grants in a relatively short time. After 1730 permissions were given for slight reason or none at all. F 12 78: 136; 79: 403.

[108] Such as an unsafe harbor; a profitless voyage from the point of construction

to the rule of import duties on all foreign goods except beef. An exception to the rule which forbade foreign goods to pass directly to the colonies without storage in a French port, allowed in 1718 "for this time only and without establishing a precedent," proved only an entering wedge. A few isolated cases even appear where vessels were given express permission to touch at the port of a foreign colony en route for the French islands.[109]

And yet, despite a fairly liberal policy in granting exceptions, merchants apparently shunned refusals or the red tape of securing permission for deviations from the law. But even in the handling of violations the council pursued a lenient policy: penalties were often remitted or moderated and this often when the evidence of evasion or pretense was clear.[110] In a relatively few cases only was the full penalty inflicted.[111]

The attitude of France with respect to foreign participation in her colonial trade was stated at all times with sufficient clearness. Nowhere is a clearer definition of her position to be found than in the following outburst of a deputy in 1725: "It is disgraceful for the nation that we suffer strangers to invade our commerce in the islands and French colonies, when they know

to the home harbor of the owner; injury by storm (F 12 67: 57; 72: 232, 562, 698); inexperience of the captain (F 12 72: 45); because only a cargo was concerned (F 12 68: 375); because of the plague during 1722.

109 A ship set sail from La Rochelle carrying in the hold a cargo of cloth for New York, where it proposed to take on grain to be exchanged in turn for sugar at St. Domingo. The lack of grain in that colony prompted this laxness. F 12 55: 110. Another relaxation in 1710 permitted a merchant of La Rochelle to add wine, brandy, and prints for Martinique at the Canaries. F 12 55: 143.

110 An instance of plain violation appeared in the selling at the Cape Verde islands of goods which had cleared for the West Indies; yet the council contented itself with exacting the customs which had been evaded. F 12 78: 31. In 1721 some prints and linen from Holland were seized at Nantes, as such merchandise was forbidden entry, but the council ordered the goods restored and gave the necessary permission for entry. F 12 68: 125. Not so generous was the enforcement of the penalty for the same offense against a merchant of Martinique, whose boat and cargo were seized and from whom a fine of three thousand livres was collected for interpreting the permission to go directly to Spain as applicable also to colonials. Boat and cargo were later restored.

111 A case appears in the records of 1709 of imprisonment and a fine of three thousand livres for carrying forbidden goods into France; and some salt which had been loaded on a colonial vessel at Cadiz as ballust was returned to the sea and a heavy fine exacted. F 12 69: 178.

so well how to prevent us from entering their colonies."[112] Foreign trade was expressly prohibited. Evidently France had been somewhat more liberal than her rivals,[113] despite her professions of faith and the numerous decrees of her council, for that body declared that the French ought to imitate the English "who do not permit any foreign vessel to enter their colonies."[114] Complaints were heard that the produce of the colonies could not be had at a reasonable price because of the foreign competition, nor could home goods be sold in the colonies at a profit; and that coin was vanishing from the colonies into the coffers of the nation's rivals.[115] This policy was adhered to faithfully in the main.[116] But colonial officers were allowed to issue at discretion blank passports, which permitted masters of ships to introduce produce from North America.[117] Even the character of foreign boats passing into French hands or to naturalized citizens became a matter for consideration. The colonial trade was declared open to a naturalized Irishman only upon proof

[112] F 12 72: 526. It is amusing that England was objecting just as strenuously to the invasion of New England by French sugar. The English attributed the success of the French to the more highly organized system of control and to the more liberal policy of French customs. English sugars had to bear a plantation duty of eighteen pence per hundred and a four and one-half per cent export duty in the Barbadoes and the Leeward isles so that French sugars were rated twenty-five to thirty per cent cheaper than those from the English islands. See Andrews, "Anglo-French commercial rivalry, 1700-1750: the western phase," in *American historical review*, 20: 763.

[113] F 12 55: 17.

[114] F 12 58: 324.

[115] A treaty with England mutually safeguarding their interests in this respect had been concluded in 1686. But it is noteworthy that England permitted the seizure of French ships only in the English West Indies, while France seized the ships of New England only when her market was glutted with barrel staves or food. For complaints see *Journal of the house of commons*, 21: 713; *Calendar of state papers*, 1700, p. 789.

[116] A proposal to allow eight Dutch ships to take supplies to the French West Indies in 1709 when the latter were reported hard pressed for the necessities of life, owing to the war, was refused because the deputies felt that the request was a ruse to secure military information. F 12 55: 17. And the declaration by the king of a resolve to grant passports to foreign vessels in view of the need of provisions in the colonies met with vigorous protest. It was noted that since the export of grains was forbidden in Great Britain and Holland under death penalty, it was likely that the plan was a subterfuge to introduce foreign manufactures. F 12 55: 111.

[117] This is the first confirmation the writer has found in these documents of the English charge of blank passports. See *Journal of the house of commons*, 21: 686.

of his change of allegiance,[118] while the action taken in several instances make it clear that no foreign crew was tolerated.[119]

The policy of restricting trade to French shipowners led, as a natural consequence, to a policy of forbidding colonials any participation in foreign colonial trade.[120] In February, 1715, the council was called upon to act on a proposition to import several hundred horses from New York to Martinique and Guadeloupe. But the deputies saw insuperable objections to the long voyage of more than fifteen hundred leagues and in the danger of illicit commerce.[121] In no wise had the attitude of France changed by the time she revised her law in 1717. The problem had merely become more pressing with greater English aggressiveness. To guard against violation captains of vessels must present on their arrival in France a list of the goods loaded at the islands, signed by a clerk of the *domaine d'occident* bureau. Pleas came up, however, from the governors that the colonies lacked the necessities of life and would perish from hunger if not properly succored.[122] In the face of such a crisis officials were given permission to bring from neighboring foreign islands beef and grain, while the French chambers of commerce, consuls, and merchants were urged in almost pathetic fashion to relieve the want of the colonies and to recover the trade which was slipping from their hands.[123]

England and her shrewd Yankee colonists were the doughty opponents who managed, for the most part with impunity, to slip manufactures, whiskey, and the horses of which the colonists had such need into the French islands. In 1725 began the

[118] F 12 55: 34.

[119] A French boat, ransomed by its owners from the English, was allowed to set sail for the islands after its return to Bordeaux but on condition that its Irish crew return to their own land.

[120] Article 4 of the decree of August, 1698, had forbidden all merchants in New France to trade with neighboring islands of foreign allegiance. F 12 70: 265. This was later partly rescinded, as will be shown.

[121] F 12 58: 324. Importation of horses or mules from Porto Rico was suggested, showing that already Spain was regarded as less dangerous than England. Here is the first of a long series of threats that if the abuse of intercolonial trade was not repressed French merchants would be obliged to forsake this commerce.

[122] F 12 68: 82.

[123] The council regarded it as astonishing and sad that merchants had abandoned the colonial trade and was convinced that French merchants, as faithful citizens, would find some remedy for the dearth prevailing in the colonies.

long series of remonstrances which came through to the council. It was stated that from January to November, 1725, the governor of Martinique had given seventeen permissions to English vessels to enter, while it was estimated that twenty vessels from New England were anchored in that colony at one time.[124] The council gave itself seriously to a consideration of the many remedies suggested.[125] By October, 1725, the king's plan was formulated for driving out free traders and resident foreigners, dividing nicely the burden of expense between king and shipowner.[126] This problem was again considered by the council on October 30. The council did not believe that the trade in horses, coal, planks, and cattle with New England should be forbidden, though it preferred to divert it to Spanish America or to New France, but it felt that precautions should be taken to prevent the entry of other foreign goods. It could not bring itself to expel the naturalized aliens, like the Irish, who had gone to the colonies after accompanying James II to France, though it had no such scruples with regard to other foreigners.[127] It hoped that the outlawry of foreign debts would discourage foreigners with the colonial trade, but recommended secrecy in any action taken.[128] In November, 1727, the council took a definite step toward increasing colonial salaries by working out a plan, proposed by the deputies, for a one per cent tax on colonial goods and supplies in France. In its final analysis it was a proposi-

[124] This estimate is for a period just a little later.

[125] One anonymous writer advocated a prohibitive tariff as more effective than all the penalties hitherto imposed. But this the deputies strongly opposed, convinced that the only remedy lay in adequate salaries for officials, in recalling officials after three years and rewarding them strictly in accord with their services; and in severely punishing illicit trade as did England. Officials promised glibly to stop the traffic, deputies declared, but no sooner had they arrived at their posts than they defended the practice. There was a brig at Martinique which was never empty, while foreigners sued openly in the courts of that colony. F 12 72: 526. The council agreed to advise a decree renewing the total prohibition of foreign trade under penalties heavy enough wholly to destroy it, the rule to be relaxed secretly for the necessities of life in case of famine. F 12 73: 517 ff. This whole question roused tremendous interest on the part of everyone concerned. F 12 73: 619.

[126] F 1273: 654 ff. gives the details.

[127] It was felt a wise precaution, however, to watch the Irish. F 12 73: 648.

[128] F 1273: 648. But the complaints went steadily on. In May, 1727, the director of the *domaine d'occident* at Martinique reported that the supplies of the last French ship had been poorly sold, as the island had been stocked up by the English, and that no return cargo was procurable. F 12 74: 402.

tion to raise the *domaine d'occident* to three and one-half per cent for three years, one per cent of which should be separately registered and turned over to an officer especially appointed to promote commerce and to exclude the foreigner.[129] The measure was found useful enough, if not in restraining the hated commerce, at least in francs and sous, to continue it by decision of December 21, 1730, for three additional years.[130]

No sooner was the rule fixed, however, than a serious earthquake at Guadeloupe in November, 1727, made it imperative to revoke it for wood and horses if that colony were not to be ruined.[131] Though Maurepas suggested that the shock was not a constant factor and sympathized with the suggestion that wood could come from Canada,[132] the council was moved to recommend that the Windward islands also be allowed for three years to trade with New England in horses, mules, cattle, and wood, on condition that these articles be exchanged for syrup and rum,[133] during which interval, however, means must be found for dispensing with this trade.[134]

[129] As the farmers-general were the greatest sufferers from the illicit trade, they agreed to relinquish one-half of one per cent of the three per cent due them. The idea was drawn from Marseilles, where the chamber of commerce had established a duty to augment the city's trade with the orient. F 12 74: 674. The working details for the collection of the tax are found in F 12 78: 708 ff. Fifteen hundred livres were to be distributed annually to the colonies in proportion to the sums collected.

[130] F 12 77: 738. If exhortations could have supplied the colonies with beef and grain, there would have been no dearth. See F 12 74: 715.

[131] A merchant from Guadeloupe attempted to show that horses from New England would cost two hundred and fifty livres in island rum and syrup — the latter otherwise a complete loss — while horses from Curaçao would cost five hundred livres in pure sugar. While the deputies were perfectly willing to allow syrup and rum to pass to New England, they were of a quite different opinion with regard to the entry of horses and wood into the West Indies, when these supplies could be drawn from Spanish America with greater advantage in their judgment. F 12 76: 173 ff. If the trade with the Spanish colonies ceased, "Ainsi finit," they mournfully reported, "une navigation qui occupoit un grand nombre de Matelots, lesquells n'ayant plus de resource pour subsister devinrent forbans." F 12 76: 188.

[132] Concerning Canada as a source of supply, Robertson remarks: "Let them try to procure their lumber from those places, if they can." Robertson, *Supplement to the detection of the state and situation of the present sugar planters of Barbadoes and Leeward islands* (1733), 25.

[133] Syrup and rum were the only supplies which could find a market in New England. F 12 76: 176.

[134] The signature of the president of the council was delayed until December 23. F 12 76: 101.

Decrees issued at the instance of the council of commerce in Paris could solve this difficult economic problem no more easily than orders in council issued in London. Complaints concerning the working of the new rule were audible in January, 1729, while a few months later the intendants of Martinique and the Windward islands reported such a dearth of ships for interior commerce that they were forced to permit colonials to buy them from the English.[135] Thus despite conscientious efforts the council met only defeat in this serious problem.

The French council can be accused of no greater consistency in its conduct than the English board of trade. While it strained every nerve — albeit unsuccessfully — to exclude foreigners from the French colonies, it connived at, even encouraged, the efforts of its subjects to snatch morsels from the Spanish trade. A mere note of permission to a merchant to import certain foreign goods to serve as cargo for the Spanish-American trade is sufficiently illuminating.[136] It was through the French islands that Havana tobacco made its way into France.[137] In 1729 the intendant of Martinique forbade the collection of forty sous on sugars for the Spanish main, claiming exemption under article fifteen of the letters patent of 1717. Maurepas held that while the article did not mention such exemption, since no one had the right to clear for Spanish America, still, considering the advantage of this commerce, the sugars transported there merited a greater favor than those from France; and that in all prohibitions of foreign trade the Spanish-American trade had not merely been excepted, but recommended. The council denied that refined or muscovado sugar so transported should be relieved of this tax, but declared it must pay the usual three per cent *domaine d'occident*.[138]

135 This furnished the occasion for a plea to ship vessels in frame and for a complaint against the French practice of selling a cargo at the Windward islands only to go to St. Domingo in order to get the return cargo of sugar cheaper. F 12 77: 38.

136 F 12 54: 89.

137 Various nations had been allowed to trade with Spanish America until 1717, when Spanish merchants won a prohibition against foreign trade in order to strengthen their own trade in Caracas. F 12 76: 131.

138 F 12 75: 676. In the same year the destruction of the cocoa trees in the French islands raised a question concerning the distinction to be made between cocoa from the French and from the Spanish colonies. The council decided to regard all cocoa landed at the islands as of colonial growth, to be entered into France under the tariff of 1717. F 12 76: 664.

In marked contrast with the English policy, intercolonial trade between the French colonies was encouraged.[139] The attitude of the council is revealed in a dispute between the directors of the *domaine d'occident* and some shipowners in the Windward islands over a decree of the intendant to collect a one per cent tax on all goods and foodstuffs passing from Martinique to Canada and Isle Royal, a three per cent *domaine d'occident* on foods of colonial growth, and forty sous on sugar.[140] The council decided that to promote a greater commerce between Canada, Isle Royal, and the Windward islands, native products from the last-named colony for Isle Royal should be free from this duty of one per cent for ten years, that all produce of those islands entering Canada, as well as Isle Royal, should be relieved of the *domaine d'occident* and of the duty of forty sous on sugar.[141]

Home manufactures, however, were in accordance with the spirit of the times supported at the expense of the colonies. For instance, in 1731 when La Rochelle complained of a scarcity of clay pots for her refineries, due to their exportation to America, the council promptly forbade their export.[142] Although bleaching of sugar was allowed to colonials, they had been forbidden in 1684 to establish refineries. Hence, when French citizens complained in 1732 of the existence of refineries in St. Domingo, steps to assure the home market to home refineries seem to have carried.[143] Protection to home manufactures also expressed itself by forbidding carriers and merchants to take to America cloth fabrics of Indian, Persian, or Chinese weave, or even foreign goods taken as prize, as they hampered the sale of French cloth.[144] And yet nowhere in these records is there evidence of a disposition to repress all colonial manufactures, while we know

139 There seemed very early in the century to have been an unfavorable attitude toward intercolonial trade. F 12 54: 289.

140 Under an old law of 1665. Merchants cited the fact that the king had never placed a customs bureau at Isle Royal as evidence that he meant to exempt goods at that port from all duty.

141 The decree is dated December 31, 1726.

142 F 12 79: 461.

143 F12 79: 524. The record is not perfectly clear on this point.

144 Chiefly of Dauphiny. The carriers of the ocean ports seem to have been guilty of drawing silks from Holland and England. May 7, 1733. F 12 79: 1040.

that coarse fabrics of wool and linen were woven, from which were fashioned trousers and nuns' robes.[145]

While it is true that in case of conflict between colonial and home interest, the inhabitants of the homeland had first consideration, it is equally true that in comparison with other countries, the council protected and guarded the colonies to a surprising degree.[146] As has been seen, storage without duty was allowed for Irish salt beef during a large portion of the period. The fisheries were also favored: foreign fish was repeatedly refused entry, even when intended for the troops.[147] In 1704 a captain was not allowed to collect pay for escorting fishing smacks to the banks of the new world for fear that it might discourage French fishers. And when the council found the cod fisheries sadly injured by the cession of Newfoundland and Plaisance to the English, it turned to the encouragement of whale fishing.[148] And especially the council was always offering recommendations to foster the sugar industry.[149]

A pressing question from 1720 to 1727 was the protection of the colonies against inferior grain.[150] At the session of January 25, 1720, Amelot himself observed that frauds in the quality and

[145] Francis Parkman, *The old régime in Canada, France and England in North America* (Boston, 1902), 298; Andrews, "Anglo-French commercial rivalry, 1700-1750: the western phase," in *American historical review*, 20: 762.

[146] The phrase "to favor the commerce of the French islands of America" occurs repeatedly in the proceedings. The remark of the president at the session of February 18, 1723, affords a good index to the royal attitude: "The king has always paid attention to means which could contribute to the increase of commerce, whether in relation to manufactures or the fisheries, not only on the sea-coasts of France, but also in Canadian waters." Article 3, F 12 71: 44. The numerous exceptions already noted should be recalled.

[147] Catalog, F 12 92: 673; 93: 633.

[148] As a first step, whale oil was relieved of a duty of fifty sous. In 1716 all fish oils were relieved for ten years of the duties levied in 1710 and 1714. F 12 58: 315. Growing directly out of this effort to encourage the fisheries at Port Royal came an attempt to favor the coal there by recommending for ten years free entry into France of coal which was loaded as ballust. And at the expiration of this exemption the tax was lowered. F 12 75: 347.

[149] In 1703 a high duty was proposed on foreign sugars entering Bayonne or Marseilles in storage or transit for Savoy or other countries. F 12 51: 197; see also F 12 55: 322.

[150] Wine, brandy, and wheat constituted the bulk of the commerce to the islands. All other goods combined amounted to scarcely one-tenth of the freight. F 12 78: 492.

weight of grain for the colonies were constantly being perpetrated.[151] The council readily drew up a decree to remedy these abuses.[152] The decree seems not to have reached the matter of weight, however, for the subject was again disturbing the councillors in 1725, together with accusations of false weight in beef and false measures in wine. The council tried to reach the whole problem by a fresh decree of August 2, providing for inspection and fines.[153] But yet the problem was far from solved. Merchants of La Rochelle and Rochefort asserted in 1727 that they would have to give up the grains of Marans, as they had been arriving at the colonies so spoiled that the troops and inhabitants did not dare to use them, and that they would have to seek them at a new point at greater expense. And so a law, designed to reach the difficulty once for all, fixed responsibility on the miller whose trademark the barrels bore for the quality of the flour until its arrival in America.[154] With this action the subject passes from the records so that it may be inferred it marks a distinct step forward.

It may justly be claimed, then, that the council of commerce was a potent factor in regulating and developing the French colonies. An important law to govern colonial trade was worked out through its agency; it served as a court in allowing exceptions and for the adjudication of cases of infringement of the laws; it became a court of appeals for the interpretation of the letters patent and of the decrees; it secured bounties and aids from the king to sustain the colonies through critical periods of their existence; it formulated, to a large extent, the foreign policy with regard to colonial trade with foreign powers; it determined the trade relations between the various French colonies; and it stimulated and fostered at all times an often wan-

[151] A bad custom had established the sale of grain by the barrel instead of by weight so that barrels rated at one hundred and eighty pounds contained only one hundred and fifty.

[152] Good grain, properly dried and without admixture, must be packed in barrels of good wood, bearing the miller's trademark and the weight; it must also be inspected after reaching the colonies. F 12 67: 25 ff.

[153] Since even in 1744 there was no fixed gauge for barrels of brandy at Nantes, a decree ordered that one-half those for the colonies must hold fifty-eight pots. F 12 67: 894.

[154] Article 21, F 12 74: 126 ff. The right of inspection seems to have been struck out in 1737, but the bakers wished it replaced for sea biscuit a year later.

ing interest on the part of French merchants in this none too profitable trade. That it became an increasingly negligible factor after the first third of the century was probably due to the fact that an organ without initiative could not force upon a government preoccupied with wars and with the mere effort to retain its territorial possessions an active participation in commerce for which it had little time or genuine interest.

Ella Lonn

Goucher College
Baltimore, Maryland

THE UNITED STATES FACTORY SYSTEM FOR TRADING WITH THE INDIANS, 1796-1822[1]

Trade with the American Indians was one of the earliest motives for the establishment of white men in North America, and the rivalry of foreign countries for a firm hold upon the continent was in large part a contest for that trade. In addition to its financial value the political influence of the Indian trade is highly significant. During the period of the revolution the rivalry between England, France, and Spain for the acquisition of the most profitable parts of North America was of critical importance; and during the infancy of the new United States government the schemes and intrigues of these countries with their individual or collective attempts to win over the Indians to alliances against the United States were serious obstacles to the realization of the promise of American independence.

The French were the first to carry on any extensive trade with the Indians. The numerous French posts which sprang up rapidly during the seventeenth century were established for either or both of two purposes: as mission stations to convert the Indians to the Roman Catholic faith or as centers for securing the lucrative gains from the fur trade. Although these posts originated from the private initiative of the French *coureurs des bois*, when once established the French government was not slow to see their possibilities and was most reluctant to give them up. As late as 1797 French agents were active in creating difficulties between the Indians and the United States, giving material aid to the Indians in strengthening their fortifications and helping them in other ways to prepare for war against the United States.[2]

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 10, 1918. While the author has done much independent investigation of the subject he can not claim to have contributed much to the excellent summary given by Miss Louise Phelps Kellogg in her admirable introduction to the *Wisconsin historical collections*, v. 20.

[2] Frederick J. Turner, "Policy of France toward the Mississippi valley," in *American historical review*, 10: 249 ff. and "Diplomatic contest for the Mississippi

The influence of the French was small, however, in comparison with that of either the British or the Spanish. The British in the northwest and the Spanish in the southwest openly supported trading houses among the Indians. Through private employees of the government as well as through these trading establishments, Spain worked among the red men of the southwest, always aiming at winning their alliance in intrigues against the United States. Having persisted during the period of the American revolution in her opposition to the American occupation of the Mississippi valley, she sought the aid of France to prevent a peace being signed with England which would give the new United States trans-Alleghanian boundaries with the right of westward settlement to the Mississippi. France, however, failed in her conciliatory efforts to uphold the Spanish restriction of the westward development of the United States and consequently after 1783 Spain, from her point of vantage at New Orleans, inaugurated many intrigues in the furtherance of a determined policy of drawing the allegiance of the trans-Alleghanian west away from the United States. Numerous instances of her use of trading posts to deflect not only all the Indian fur trade of the southwest to New Orleans but also all political control over the Indians whether legally within the United States or not, are well known. Once in control of the powerful Indian tribes of the region, Spain had an effective weapon for use against the United States, her real foe in the eventful contest for the permanent possession of the rich Mississippi valley. The varied ramifications of Panton, Leslie and company, the great Scotch fur trading company, and its semi-official relations with the European governments contending long so successfully with the infant United States fastened a control over the Indians hard for the United States to destroy.[3]

valley,'' in *Atlantic monthly*, 93: 676 ff., 807 ff.; also ''Correspondence of the French ministers to the United States, 1791-1797,'' in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1903 (Washington, 1904), v. 2.

[3] Thomas M. Green, *The Spanish conspiracy* (Cincinnati, 1891); French E. Chadwick, *The relations of the United States and Spain: the Spanish-American war* (New York, 1911); Paul C. Phillips, *The west in the diplomacy of the American revolution* (*University of Illinois studies in the social sciences*, 2: nos. 2 and 3 — Urbana, 1913); Edward S. Corwin, *French policy and the American alliance of 1778* (Princeton, 1916); William R. Shepherd, ''Papers bearing on James Wilkinson's relations with Spain, 1788-1789,'' in *American historical review*, 9: 748 ff. and ''Wilkinson and the beginning of the Spanish conspiracy,'' *ibid.*, 9: 190 ff.; George L. Rives,

The British government in the northwest before 1754 utilized only privately-established trading posts to increase its hold upon the region. Thereafter through these private traders and her own government posts Great Britain guarded well her friendship with the copper-colored warriors of the northwest. Maintaining always an active fur trade with the Indians she distinctly disclaimed any designs of dispossessing them of their lands for agricultural purposes. At the same time she continually and very cleverly called the Indians' attention to the fact that the Americans, in their desire for land for agricultural settlements in the Ohio valley, were persistently aiming at the ultimate dispossession of the Indians. This British influence was especially evident during the last decade of the eighteenth century when the United States was seeking to treat with the various Indian tribes. History sustains Washington in his declaration in 1794 that the British were stirring up Indian hostilities and doing all in their power to prevent the successful conclusion of a treaty between the United States and the northwestern Indians.[4]

All three countries, France, Great Britain, and Spain, but especially the two last named, saw in their relations with the Indians a means of opposing the westward expansion of the United States. Through their respective traders and direct political agents, therefore, they sought to gain the friendship of the Indians with a view not only to enriching themselves by trade but also to influencing the Indians to oppose the American advance upon their rich "spheres of influence." "Naturally the foreign fur trading companies tended towards monopoly. At the several portages they secured the right of way; at the emporia the best of provisions and supplies; among the winterers they had their choice of men; and the returns of their 'brigades' were as valuable as the argosies of the Spanish main. Their influence was felt not only in provincial but in national parliaments; diplomacy was not seldom exercised on their behalf and they dictated the terms of several international treaties."[5]

"Spain and the United States in 1795," *ibid.*, 4: 62 ff.; Franklin L. Riley, "Spanish policy in Mississippi after the treaty of San Lorenzo," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1897 (Washington, 1897), 176 ff.

[4] *Washington's writings* (Evans ed.—1905), 370.

[5] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 19: xvi.

The United States, failing more or less completely in attempts to perfect binding treaties with the Indians, at last resorted to the policy of her rivals of winning them by trade. The year 1775 saw the first beginning of the slow evolution of a government system for trade with the Indians, when a committee of congress was appointed to devise a plan of operation. In the next year the purchase of goods for the trade was ordered and all unlicensed trade was prohibited.[6] Frequent but unsystematic conduct of the trade was undertaken during the period of the confederacy. In 1786 an ordinance was passed separating the Indian department into two divisions with a superintendent and deputies over each division, charged with the duties of executing the congressional regulations and of granting licenses to trade with the Indians; they were under obligation to make frequent reports and to carry on continual correspondence with the secretary of war. Foreigners were forbidden the trade while American citizens were required to pay fifty dollars a year for a certificate of license to trade. The superintendents and deputies were at the same time forbidden to be engaged privately in the trade. The efforts to apply the system proved ineffective owing to the general disorganization in the affairs of the government of the United States at the time. By the law of 1790 the license system was retained with a two-year license from the president as a feature and the omission of the former prohibition of foreigners from the trade; no specification was made as to the amount to be paid for the licenses.[7] Finally a law was passed on April 18, 1796, authorizing the establishment of the desired trading posts under the immediate direction of the president. The supporters of the bill in congress urged that such an act was necessary to protect the Indians from the exploitation of numerous imposters. The Indians themselves, it was asserted, sought the aid of the United States in the enforcement upon them by governmental enactment of the first nation-wide prohibition of the liquor traffic among the tribes. Underlying all the expressed reasons was the dominant one of securing the permanent attachment of the Indians to the United States in order that the natural westward expansion of the American na-

[6] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 19: xvi.

[7] *Ibid.*, 19: xviii, 311, 326 ff.

tion might be facilitated and that the dangers to the United States from continual Indian conflicts be removed.

The act of 1796 authorized public trade by government traders, who were to carry on "liberal trade with the Indians" as advantageously to the Indians as possible so long as the original capital of $150,000 voted by congress was undiminished.[8] Permanent trading houses were to be established as necessary, at which all transactions with the Indians were to be carried on by the government agents. In 1800 two such houses were established, one at Coleraine on the frontier of Georgia and the other at Tellico Blockhouse on the border between Tennessee and the Cherokee nation.[9] Bright seemed the prospects for these factories and Secretary of War Dearborn confidently reported to the president that "the Intercourse which grows from such establishments has a powerful tendency towards strengthening and confirming the friendship of the Indians to the people and government of the United States, and towards detaching them from the influence of neighboring governments."[10] In 1802 four additional factories were established at Detroit, Fort St. Stephen, Chickasaw Bluffs, and Fort Wayne; and the next year a new act was passed authorizing further establishments. By 1809 eight more factories were founded: at Arkansa, Belle Fontaine, Natchitoches, and Chicago in 1805; Sandusky in 1806; and the island of Michilimackinac, Fort Osage, and Fort Madison in 1808.[11] Of these Detroit was discontinued in 1805 and Belle Fontaine in 1808, leaving in the year 1809 twelve United States government trading houses in operation.

The initial prospects of these trading houses were encouraging indeed. In spite of the exertion of the foreign traders to withdraw the confidence of the Indians from the United States and to inspire in them jealousies and unfriendliness toward the frontier people, the Indians, drawn by the low prices charged by the American posts for the supplies they needed, came readily forward to trade with the Americans, apparently eager to profit by the advantages offered. The factories accordingly flourished; in 1801 it was reported that the business had been so suc-

[8] *American state papers: Indian affairs,* 1: 654.
[9] *Ibid.,* 1: 643.
[10] *Ibid.,* 1: 654.
[11] *Ibid.,* 1: 655, 824.

cessfully conducted that an increase of from three to four per cent on the original stock had been secured.[12] Unfortunately, events soon began to show the reverse side of the shield.

Although by 1800 a few American traders had appeared at Prairie du Chien and Mackinac, the northwest was still largely in the possession of the more numerous and more experienced British and French traders. The question of American licenses, it is true, occasioned considerable embarrassment to the foreign traders, and the United States territorial regulations were found to interfere with the established French and British usages. The establishment of the United States factories at Chicago and at the Sauk cities on the Mississippi, moreover, certainly tended to disturb the equilibrium and profits of the British traders, while the expedition of Zebulon M. Pike up the Mississippi from St. Louis in 1805-1806 to warn the British traders not to display their country's flag on American soil undoubtedly made them realize that a time of reckoning with the United States interests was bound sooner or later to come. Nevertheless, determined not to give up until forced to do so, they continued to make the most of their superior organization and knowledge of Indian character. The embargo act made it more difficult for both sides to obtain European supplies for their trade, but while the superintendent of Indian trade at Washington was writing plausible excuses to be given by the government factors to their tribal customers the enterprising British trader, Robert Dickson, long well known to the northwest Indians, was eluding the embargo by conveying goods to his clients in the Wisconsin forests over a circuitous route of extraordinary length, from Montreal to Pittsburgh, down the Ohio river to its mouth, and thence up the Mississippi to his old posts.[13]

With the war of 1812 and the signing of the treaty of Ghent in December, 1814, the British fur traders lost their former ascendency on American soil. With the restoration of the important mart of Mackinac to the United States the British traders and Indian agents removed their military posts to the nearest possible sites within the British boundaries, Amherstburg opposite Detroit and Drummond Island just east of the Mackinac

[12] *American state papers: Indian affairs*, 1: 654, 683.
[13] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 19: xvii.

straits. There they inaugurated a systematic policy of flattery and gift-giving to the Indians with the hope of counteracting the American overtures and retaining their former hold upon the Indians. They did not despair, even, of regaining the northwest when the next expected clash of their country with the United States should occur. Friction naturally arose between the neighboring British and American agents, as the letters of William Henry Puthuff, the United States agent at Mackinac, testify.[14]

Distressing times now befell the Wisconsin French traders who had been among the most faithful subjects of the British. Left by the treaty within the United States, they were still allied to the British by ties of custom, self-interest, and association. With an undefined status they found themselves neither British nor American citizens. Unable to obtain titles to the lands which they had inherited from their ancestors and had long cultivated, they were at the same time suspected and often harassed by officious American agents, their furs seized, their licenses revoked, and every possible obstacle placed in the path of the only method they had of earning a livelihood for their families.[15] In their dilemma, John Jacob Astor, already a power in the Wisconsin trade, saw his opportunity. Having secured the passage by congress of an act April 29, 1816, by which foreigners were excluded from any participation in the fur trade within the United States except in subordinate capacities under American traders, he cleverly began through his agents to enlist the distressed French traders of Wisconsin in the service of his American fur company, which then succeeded to the interests of both the North West and Southwest companies. Within his field of operation he then began from his base at Mackinac to embrace the region of the Great lakes, the upper Mississippi, and the entire length of the Missouri, with headquarters at St. Louis. Having driven out the competing British traders by the exclusion law of 1816 he successfully defended his own practice of engaging foreigners in his service. His faith-

[14] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 19: 420; 20: 32, 88 ff.

[15] *Ibid.*, 20: 80, 145 ff.; Frederick J. Turner, "The character and influence of the Indian trade in Wisconsin, a study of the trading posts as an institution," in *Johns Hopkins university studies in historical and political science* (Baltimore, 1891), 9: 547 ff.

ful lieutenant, Ramsay Crooks, had by 1819 induced the war department at Washington to clear up the disputed construction of the law in regard to Astor's use of foreigners and the territorial extent of licenses so that the St. Louis officials were directed to recognize the validity of the licenses of the American fur company's Mackinac traders.[16]

During the same period the United States government was also extending both its posts and trading factories within the borders of Wisconsin and the northwest. In 1816 Fort Howard at Green Bay and Fort Crawford at Prairie du Chien, with Indian agencies auxiliary to both establishments, were founded. Then the government extended its factory system to the northwest as an aggressive movement to diminish the power and influence of the British traders. A new phase of the fur trade was thus begun. Thereafter government agents and private traders competed one with another for the trade of the Indians. With the bars down the traders became disorganized while a horde of adventurous Americans entered the lists against the old established trading families who were allied to the Indians by intermarriage and well trained in the efficient methods of the French and British régimes. With the gradual location of the factories alongside the American military posts numerous broils arose between the soldiers and the factors. While the treaties made by American officials with the Indian tribes at Portage des Sioux in 1815 and 1816 were made possible only by the threats of the Americans, the Winnebago as a whole refused to treat and remained for years sullen towards the United States. Down to 1825 the Wisconsin Indians made annual visits to Drummond Island and Amherstburg to consult with their wily British father and to receive their customary presents.[17]

Nevertheless, the earnest efforts of the United States after 1815 to gain control of the northwest fur trade, to expel inhabitants unwilling to become American citizens, to build and garrison the forts, and to rehabilitate the government fur trading factories at first bade fair to achieve success; in particular the out-

[16] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: xi; Hiram H. Chittenden, *The American fur trade of the far west, a history of the pioneer trading posts and early fur companies of the Missouri valley and the Rocky mountains and of the overland commerce with Santa Fe* (New York, 1902), 1: 167 ff., 310 ff.

[17] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: xix ff.

look for the factory system seemed for a time bright. Even British observers and interested parties prophesied beneficial effects from the fair dealings with the Indians. The Indians, it was said, who had at Green Bay paid fifteen dollars for a pound of tobacco and a dollar and a half for a thimble would readily recognize and appreciate the benevolence of a government that sold them articles at cost and paid them full market value for their furs.[18]

Some features of the Indian trade, however, were overlooked by the United States when it inaugurated its cash system. The Indian, frequently improvident, had no reserve stock of necessities. He could not possibly go out on his winter hunt unless he was supplied in advance on unsecured credit with firearms, ammunition, clothing, and many sundries. He was accustomed to pledge to private traders who furnished the supplies the peltries he expected to gather. Naturally, when advancing goods at such risks, the trader charged the highest prices while he gave the Indian as little as possible for his furs on his return from the hunt. Knowing well how shifty and uncertain the Indians were in all financial affairs, the trader sent clerks and voyageurs to follow many of his Indian debtors to their hunting grounds to secure on the spot all the peltry possible. The practice of stopping others in the forest and along the streams on their return to the summer villages became common. Almost wholly depleted of the results of their winter's hunt, the Indians reached Green Bay, Prairie du Chien, or the other posts with but few skins to sell to the government factors on a strict market basis.[19]

The United States government failed to foresee and avoid another difficulty. Both the French and British officials had periodically made considerable presents to their Indian wards. Weapons, ammunition, utensils, clothing, ornaments, and liquor had been distributed with a free hand as annuities for the insurance of the Indians' good will. Not only were the United States factors not supplied with such presents for distribution, but they were even held to a very strict accountability for all goods in their hands so that there was no opportunity for well-

[18] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: xiii, 1 ff., 37 ff.

[19] *Ibid.*, 20: xiv; Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 1: 13 ff.

placed American advertising. The Indians, of course, considered the factors contemptible for their parsimony and suspected them further of withholding gifts the government meant the Indians to have. Moreover, the Indians were unable to obtain any liquor from the factories because of the United States' prohibition of the traffic; at the same time, however, the government failed to enforce its prohibitive law in the case of private traders, thus giving a heavy advantage to the factors' rivals.

The square dealing at the factory soon lost its charm for the Indian when he found he could get neither the necessary credit, nor presents, nor liquor, for all three were obtainable at the unofficial trading posts. At the same time it was but natural for the Indians to hold in contempt a government that turned trader, especially when they often heard the private traders dub the government factors "Dam Yankee pedlars."[20]

Further, the local agents of the great fur companies, such as the American, were often married to native women and had long lived in the region. Supported by a great corporation under the management of Americans who had strong influence at Washington, these agents were the foreign rivals of whom the government factors so bitterly complained in their reports.[21]

The private traders did not stop with their efforts to oust the factories by competition alone. As early as 1816 St. Louis merchants made a direct appeal to congress to abolish the factories; in the next year began the series of attacks which resulted within five years in the overthrow of the system and the complete triumph of Astor's American fur company. The recommendation of both the secretary of war and the house committee on Indian affairs of an increase of capital and the exclusion of foreigners from the trade had an immediate result, however, in a new act, which continued the system on its existing basis for another year. In large part it was the support given by the able and honest superintendent of Indian trade, Thomas L. McKenney, which thus prolonged the life of the system. Advocating in an elaborate report the doubling of the number of factories, he contended that, in order to determine whether the plan was successful, it ought to be conducted for a time on a

[20] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 1: 13 ff.; *Wisconsin historical collections*, 7: 272, 20: xv.

[21] *Ibid.*, 7: 275 ff.

scale in correspondence with the government's resources and not with its paltry $300,000 capitalization merely as a competitor to private concerns.[22] When the American fur company, under the leadership of Ramsay Crooks and seconded by the St. Louis traders, inaugurated its campaign for the abolition of the factories, it found an attorney in the astute Senator Thomas H. Benton, who handled the case so well in congress that the investigating committee which reported on February 16, 1820, declared the factories to be "productive of very serious injuries." At the same time it was proposed that the federal government should either take the entire Indian trade into its own hands, or let it be surrendered to a single licensed corporation to be held for abuses. Influenced by the report of McKenney this same committee on April 5 reversed its position and recommended the continuance of the system.[23]

At this critical point the philanthropic interests of the east came to the defense of the system. In response to a renewed demand for the civilization of the Indians, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun despatched the Reverend Jedidiah Morse on an extensive western tour to report upon Indian trade conditions. His report, however, surprised the east by recommending the abolition of the factory system because of the undoubted misunderstanding the Indians had of its purpose and because of its failure as a civilizing agency.[24]

This unexpected support encouraged the American fur company to continue its fight. Then, too, Ninian Edwards of Illinois, Lewis Cass of Michigan, and several other prominent western statesmen repeatedly expressed their disapproval of the system. While some of these were doubtless influenced by their own or their constituents' private interests, some, as apparently in Cass' case, based their opinion on personal experience and observation of the ineffectiveness of the system under the existing western conditions.[25]

[22] *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: xv, 37 ff., 66 ff.; Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 1: 15; *American state papers: Indian affairs*, 2: 127, 181.

[23] *Ibid.*, 2: 201 ff.; *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: 162 ff.

[24] Jedidiah Morse, *Report to the secretary of war of the United States on Indian affairs* (New Haven, 1822); *American state papers: Indian affairs*, 2: 274.

[25] Ninian W. Edwards, *History of Illinois from 1778 to 1833, and life and times of Ninian Edwards* (Springfield, 1870); *Wisconsin historical collections*, 19: 395, 20: 82 ff., 204, 242.

Finally, in the seventeenth congress, Benton as chairman of the senate committee on Indian affairs forced the issue by the introduction of the bill for the abolition of the system. The factory system, he contended, had been inaugurated to remedy the evil caused by permitting the British, under article three of Jay's treaty of 1795, to navigate the Mississippi and to trade with Indians within the limits of the United States. Apprehending that, at the time, American private traders had neither the capital nor the strength to gain the good will of the Indians in trade and thereby to counteract the British influence, congress had placed the factory system in operation in the west simultaneously with the surrender of the western posts by the English in the summer of 1796.

Looking into the operations of the system, however, Benton found upon examination of the itemized list of purchases of goods by the superintendent for the Indians a charge for eight gross of jewsharps. Clearly convinced that many of the items before this one were articles useless to the Indians, Benton here stopped to remark that he had not seen jewsharps "enumerated among the articles of Indian commerce in Sir Alexander McKenzie's history of the fur trade, nor could he perceive in what manner they could be used efficaciously in expelling British traders from the Northwestern Territories. But the present superintendent had superadded some objects of a different character: schemes for the amendment of the heads and hearts of the Indians; to improve their moral and intellectual faculties; to draw them from the savage and hunter state, and induct them into the innocent pursuits of civilized life. In the execution of these schemes, the jewsharps might have their use. They are musical instruments, and 'music hath charms to sooth the savage heart. . .' It has been related," Benton continued, "of a musician of old, that he even tamed wild beasts, and bent down the tops of trees, and drew a woman out of hell, by the potent charms of music. In modern times it has also been said,

> 'He that hath not music in his soul,
> Is fit for treason, stratagem and spoil'."

These instruments were innocent instruments, and on that account had been spared where better had been condemned. An ordinance of the city of Hartford, against fifes and drums, con-

tained express exception in favor of the jewsharp. They were innocent and adapted to the purposes of the superintendent in reclaiming the savage from the hunter state. The first state after that, in the road to refined life, was the pastoral, and without music the tawny-colored Corydons and the red-skinned Amaryllises, "recubans sub tegmine fagi" upon the banks of the Missouri and Mississippi could make no progress in the delightful business of love and sentiment. Even if the factories should be abolished, these harps might not be lost. They might be "'hung upon the willows' and Aeolus, as he passes by, might discourse upon them melancholy music, 'soft and sad' adapted to the vicissitudes of human affairs, the death of the factories, and the loss of the innocent age they were intended to introduce."[26]

In substantiation of his persistent charge that the superintendent had purchased supplies of very inferior quality at exorbitantly high prices and sold them to the Indians at an unreasonable advance, Benton submitted the testimony of individual traders and Indian agents, some if not all of whom were personally desirous of eliminating the factors as competitors while others, such as Crooks, were prominent in the employ of Astor. The factors, he contended, had violated every provision of the law which obligated them to sell only to the Indians on liberal terms so as to save the original stock from being diminished. O'Fallon, Crooks, and others established for Benton that the goods had been sold to officers, soldiers, citizens, and private traders in direct violation of the letter of the act of congress and the policy of the government in establishing the factories. A capricious system of sale prices, constantly changing to meet competition and higher or lower as rivals were far off or near at hand, was said to prevail among the factors.[27] Furthermore, Benton charged that the superintendent, in defiance of the law

[26] *Annals of congress,* 17 congress, 1 session, 317, 359, 364, 433; *American state papers: Indian affairs,* 2: 260 ff., 326 ff. As a matter of fact jewsharps were a well-known article of the Indian trade.

[27] It is now known that the government factories could not well do otherwise if they were to compete with the American fur company, which used this very method to annihilate individual traders and the government factories. Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west,* 1: 313 ff.; *Wisconsin historical collections,* 20: xviii, 36, 56, 61, 103, 162 ff., 211 ff., 381.

requiring the sales of the furs at different places at auction to the greatest advantage of the United States, had disposed of them principally at Georgetown, many under private contracts below the market prices.

Johnson of Louisiana, King of New York, R. M. Johnson of Kentucky, Van Buren of New York, and Lowrie of Pennsylvania, controverted Benton's charges of the abuses of the system and frauds of the superintendent and factors. Lowrie disclosed correctly that the real defects lay in the system itself and not in any fraudulent administration of it. The capital furnished was clearly inadequate for the object, that capital, furthermore, had been found difficult to manage in an Indian border extending over several thousand miles. In such an extended market, he argued, the purchase of articles suitable for the wants, real or imaginary, the wishes and the caprices of the various tribes, the transportation, care, and sale of the furs, involved such a complication of circumstances that it was impossible for the government to conduct the traffic. "Nothing but individual enterprise, individual industry and attention," he contended, "is equal to such a business." Disapproving of the entrance of the government into private trade, he would confine its functions strictly to proper public objects, leaving the Indian trade to individual initiative under government regulation. "In every competition," he asserted, "individual interest is always too sharp-sighted where the Government is a party." Unable to discern any advantages to the Indians from a system supplying at the time so small a part of their trade, he advocated the opening of the trade to free but properly regulated competition, by which the Indians would be better supplied on better terms.[28]

To such views was added the fact that investigation proved that neither the Chicago nor the Green Bay factory served its purpose, as nearly all the sales were to civilian whites; while the one at Prairie du Chien was practically insolvent, having caused a loss to the government of $12,300 besides harboring bad debts to the amount of $14,404. Scarcely a third of the entire federal investment of $300,000 in the factories was ever recovered, while

[28] *Annals of congress,* 17 congress, 1 session, 326, 339 ff., 351; *American state papers: Indian affairs,* 2: 326 ff.

the merchandise left on hand at the closure was so inferior in quality that the officials of the Indian department refused to make gifts of it to the Indians in council assembled.[29]

Upon the overthrow of the system by congress in March, 1822, Benton received from Crooks his congratulations for the victory which was "the best proof of the value to the country of talents, intelligence, and perseverance." "You deserve," Crooks said, "the unqualified thanks of the community for destroying the pious monster, since to your unwearied exertions and sound practical knowledge of the whole subject the country is indebted for its deliverance from so gross and unholy an imposition."[30] Under the adroit management of this same Crooks, the American fur company, after throttling the official factors, then proceeded to push its private rivals to the wall, destroying all but the shrewdest and most unscrupulous.[31]

The system disappeared without occasioning any noticeable inconveniences to the Indians.[32] Easily adjusting certain treaties with one or two tribes which specified that public trading houses should be maintained among them the government removed its factories without any disastrous effect upon the fur trade as a whole. It must now be confessed also that the meritorious system so fraught in its conception with good for the red men failed to avert the long and bloody Indian wars and the attendant corruption and bad faith which have gained for Americans an unenviable reputation for dishonorable conduct towards their dependent wards. Far from achieving the undermining of the influence of foreign powers among the Indians, the United States trading houses if anything tended towards the strengthening of the attachment of the natives to their foreign friends. The influence of France, Great Britain, and Spain among the Indians was diminished during the first two decades of the nineteenth century by force of arms and by diplomatic and legal procedure. The rapid rise after the war of 1812 of private American traders, well fitted to follow in the footsteps of the

[29] *American state papers: Indian affairs*, 2: 517, 532 ff.

[30] Chittenden, *American fur trade of the far west*, 1: 15.

[31] *Ibid.*, 1: *passim*; *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: 290 ff.

[32] The bill abolishing the system passed the senate May 2, 1822; it passed the house and was approved May 6. *Annals of congress*, 17 congress, 1 session. For closures see *Wisconsin historical collections*, 20: 265, 278.

foreign ones then expelled, reduced the necessity for the continuance for commercial purposes of an inadequately supported government system.

This early effort of the government to assume its social responsibilities, however, must always be commendable. The popular failure to support the government in its undertaking to control the heartless commercial individualism of its citizens is easily understood by any student of western American history, but is none the less regrettable. Because of it the government had to turn to new methods of dealing with the Indian question, to be met at every turn with the opposition of a mercenary public opinion which insisted, to a shameful degree, upon the prostitution of the Indian service for personal and partisan advantages.

Royal B. Way

Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN CANADA, 1918-1919

Following the precedent of last year's survey, it will be convenient first to deal briefly with Canadian historical activities relating to the war. The present survey covers roughly the period July, 1918, to July, 1919. It may therefore be said to cover the interregnum between war and peace, between the signing of the armistice and the signing of the treaty of peace. The war is over, and with it the pall that has been hanging over the world for four long years, deadening all activities that did not contribute to its successful prosecution. Men and nations are free to turn again to the manifold tasks that were laid aside in 1914 or later. But the transformation must inevitably be gradual. Until the treaty was finally signed there could be no assurance that the armistice was anything more than a breathing-space between two great periods of the war; and even when the treaty brought reasonable assurance that the venomous snake had been severely scotched, and that the world was free for at least a generation or so, it was too much to expect that mankind could throw off immediately the devastating effects of such an experience. Before the journey of peace may be resumed, the badly-damaged car must be reconstructed, and in the light of these last four tragic years it will probably be rebuilt upon radically different lines. Those who have lived through the conflict to help in the rebuilding of what we hope will be a saner and perhaps more friendly world, must look back upon that period that ended in July, 1914, as something curiously alien. Contemporary history has become a thing of the immediate present, with tremendous potentialities, and all that lies behind it is chiefly important in so far as it contributes to a clearer view of the vital problems that confront the world today. All of which would rather incline one to brush aside as unimportant much that formerly seemed worth recording, were it not for the fact that among the greatest lessons of the war is or should be that of humility. Who dare say at the present moment what does or does not

contribute to a clearer view of the problems of democracy? The wiser plan—particularly in such a general survey as this professes to be—surely is to record what has been done or attempted, leaving the question of values for future determination.

The War

The preparation of the war archives survey, referred to in last year's review, has been continued by the Dominion archives. It now fills a dozen or more large volumes, and when complete will be an invaluable source of information to students of the war. The work of collecting material for the Canadian war museum has been continued with good results. During the past year very large consignments of war relics and trophies have been and are still being received in Canada. Since December, 1918, the work of collecting in France has been under the direction of Lieutenant-Colonel Beckles Willson. The archives now have a large collection of captured aeroplanes, field guns, machine guns, rifles, swords, flags, helmets, uniforms, and the like. The collection of proclamations now numbers over one thousand five hundred; many German proclamations have been obtained, including those announcing the battle of Jutland and the sentences pronounced on Miss Cavell and Captain Fryatt. There are also more than four thousand posters. Large numbers of posters have been obtained from Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, France, Italy, Brazil, Greece, Russia, and Germany, besides some from other countries. No definite plans have as yet been adopted for the permanent housing of the war museum and of the war records, but it is hoped that provision will soon be made for this purpose. The matter is at present in the hands of a committee consisting of Sir Edmund Walker, Brigadier-General Cruikshank, and Mr. Doughty, which is to make a full report to the Dominion government as to the character and site of the proposed museum. It is expected that this building, which will house the great collection of war relics and pictures, will harmonize with the group of buildings on Parliament hill, and will be a fitting memorial to the Canadian men and women who sacrificed their lives in the war.

The series of *Proclamations, orders in council and documents relating to the European war*, five volumes of which have been

issued bringing the compilation down to October 1, 1916, has unfortunately been discontinued by the department of the secretary of state of Canada owing to lack of funds. Two volumes have now been issued of the coöperative history, *Canada in the great war*, referred to in last year's survey. The first volume covers the military history of Canada from 1608 to 1914, in a series of concise chapters by various qualified writers. The second volume deals with Canada's preparation for the war. Volumes III and IV, the former of which is expected to be published in September, 1919, and the latter in November, 1919, are devoted respectively to Canada's share in the war on the sea and the first stages of the conflict on land. The two remaining volumes, to be issued in 1920, will bring the story of Canada's participation in the war down to its final conclusion.

During the year there appeared the third volume of *Canada in Flanders,* the official story of the Canadian expeditionary force. The first two volumes, it will be remembered, were by Lord Beaverbrook. The third, which deals with the operations of the Canadian army on the Somme in the autumn of 1916, is by Major Charles G. D. Roberts, author of an excellent history of Canada and many volumes of fiction and poetry. Other books of more or less permanent value as records of different phases of the war, as seen through Canadian eyes, are Colonel F. McKelvey Bell's *First Canadians in France*;[1] Captain R. J. Manion's *A surgeon in arms*; Colonel George G. Nasmith's *The fringe of the great fight*; Lieutenant Jack Munroe's *Mopping up*; Scout Joe Cassels' *The Black Watch*; George E. Pearson's *The escape of a Princess Pat*; Emily P. Weaver's *Canadian V. C. book*; Colonel William Wood's *Flag and fleet*; Arthur Hunt Chute's *The real front*; J. George Adami's *War story of the Canadian army medical corps*; Douglas L. Durkin's *Fighting men of Canada*; Henri Beland's *My three years in a German prison*; Private Simmons' *Three times and out*; Captain T. G. Roberts' *Thirty Canadian V. C.'s*; Colonel Herbert A. Bruce's *Politics and the Canadian army medical corps*; *Under three flags*, by St. Clair Livingston and Ingeborg Steen-Hansen; M. A. Clark's *A war nurse's diary*; *Pen pictures from the trenches*, by Lieutenant Stanley Rutledge; Frank C. McDonald's

[1] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 240.

The kaiser's guest; *Out of the jaws of Hunland*, by Private Jack Evans and Corporal Fred McMullen; *Canada's day of glory*, by F. A. McKenzie; *Hunting the Hun*, by Captain James Belton and Lieutenant E. C. O'Dell; and *Letters of a Canadian stretcher-bearer*, by R. A. L., edited by Anna Chapin Ray; *Economic prices in the war*, by W. A. Mackintosh; *Ideals and training of a flying officer*, by R. W. MacLennan; *Aviation in Canada, 1917-1918*, compiled by Ian Sullivan; *Addresses delivered during the war*, by Sir Edmund Wallace; and *England, Canada, and the great war*, by Lieutenant-Colonel L. J. Desjardins. Most of these are self-explanatory. It may be noted that Dr. Adami's book is the first volume of an authoritative history of the Canadian army medical corps in the war, published under the auspices of the Canadian war records office. Dr. Beland, formerly postmaster general of Canada, was in Belgium at the beginning of the war. He immediately offered his services as a medical man to one of the Belgian hospitals. Although he was promised protection by the German military authorities, he was arrested, without any shadow of a pretext, and sent to a prison in Berlin, where he remained for three years. His book has also been published in French under the title *Mille et un jours en prison à Berlin*. Colonel Bruce's book contains the substance of his report on the organization of the Canadian army medical corps, which has been the subject of bitter controversy in Canada. Of Canadian official publications relating to the war, the most important is Sir Edward Kemp's *Report on the overseas military forces of Canada*, 1918. Of Canadian books in French bearing on the war may be specially mentioned Fernand Rinfret's *Un voyage en Angleterre et au front Français*, a series of articles by a well-known Montreal journalist which first appeared in his newspaper *Le Canada*.

Much of the historical material published in Canadian magazines and in the transactions of Canadian societies during the period under review also relates to the war and Canada's participation therein. One notes, for instance, in the *Revue Canadienne*, "Némésis et l'Allemagne," by Sir A. B. Routhier; "Trois professeurs soldats," by Réné Gautheron; and "Jacques Pineau, soldat de la classe 14," by Edward Gouin; in *Le Canada Français*, "Pour l'anniversaire de Courcelette: le 22e

bataillon Canadien-Français," by Abbé Camille Roy; in the *University magazine*, "How the Canadians came to Fresnoy," by C. F. Lloyd; "Wounded and captured," by A. F. Field; "O-Pip!" by J. A. Holland; "Turned soldier," by Archibald Malloch; "Papers from the front," by J. A. Holland; "Watchers of the sea" and "The fight against the U boat," by Patrick Vaux; and in the *Canadian magazine*, "The spirit of the army," by T. G. Roberts and "Canada organized for aerial fighting," by A. D. Camp. A number of articles that should be noted here also appeared in periodicals outside Canada, such as "Canada's war relief work," by Sir Herbert Ames, in the *Annals of the American academy* (September, 1918); "Quebec and the draft," by H. F. Gadsby, in *Century* (June, 1918); "How the Canadians got into the war game," in the *Literary digest* (January 5, 1918); "Canada and the Siberian expedition," by G. Gray, in the *Nation* (February 1, 1919); "Canada's after-war problems," by P. T. McGrath, in the *Review of reviews* (January, 1919); and "Reconstruction in Canada," by J. A. Stevenson, in the *Survey* (January 4, 1919).

The presidential address at the last annual meeting of the Royal society of Canada, by Rodolphe Lemieux, was on the very timely subject, "Le Canada, la guerre et demain." A paper was read before section II by Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank on "Trench life in France and Flanders, 1915-1916," consisting of extracts from the journal of a Canadian field officer on the western front. Addresses on "Holland in war time," by A. L. Clarke; "With the Queen's hospital in Cairo," by Dr. Ryan; "Alsace Lorraine," by Dr. De Champ; and "The student at arms," by Major W. L. Grant, were delivered before the Lennox and Addington historical society; "With the 'Little Black Devils'," by Sergeant-Major G. W. Gorman, was given before the Thunder Bay historical society. It may be mentioned that the Kent historical society has taken up the task of preparing and preserving a record of military services rendered by men and women of Kent county in the war of 1914-1918. The Lennox and Addington historical society will publish this year a history of war work done by the county, including short biographical sketches of every soldier or nurse, photographic illustrations of those killed in action, an account

of the work done by the various war organizations in the county, and statements of the amounts received for all loans and patriotic purposes. Similar compilations are being prepared by several other historical societies. Addresses on various aspects of the war have been delivered before the Canadian clubs of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg, and other cities, and have since been published in their annual publications.

Acquisition of Material

A considerable amount of documentary material has been placed on the shelves of the Dominion archives during the last few months. Much of this consists of transcripts of documents in Paris, copied during the period of the war and now transmitted to Canada. These include documents from the Archives des colonies, Archives de la marine, Ministère de la guerre, Ministère des affaires étrangères. Of the Archives des colonies, the transcriptions of series B — orders of the king and despatches — so far as it relates to Canada, is complete. From London the archives are receiving continuations of the transcripts of the Admiralty secretary papers, Chatham papers, Treasury solicitor's papers and Foreign state papers. In Canada the copying of the records of the Prévôté de Quebec, of the Conseil supérieur and of the Courthouse of Montreal is being continued. Photostat copies have been made of a record book of the township of Sidney, Upper Canada, for the period 1790-1849, and of documents relating to the military government of Trois Rivières, 1760-1764. The archives have also been the recipient of twenty-four large volumes of transcripts of the records and papers of John Graves Simcoe, first lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada. Among various original documents recently received is a curious and interesting agreement regulating the beaver trade, drawn up at Quebec in 1700, between the inhabitants of Canada and the lessee of the king's rights in the *domaine d'occident.* It bears the signatures of ninety-two of the foremost inhabitants of the colony at the time. The archives have also received the papers of the late Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney of the Northwest territories; and have secured photostat copies of the original autobiography of John Macdonald of Garth, one of the principal members of the North West company.

The most important document added to the library of McGill university during the past year is a deed of gift by Maisonneuve to Henri Perrin and Esloy Tarry dit la Haye. The concession was for thirty arpents in what is now the heart of Montreal, and the seigniorial dues on the land were three deniers an arpent. The whole deed is in Maisonneuve's own handwriting and is dated at the court of Ville Marie, January 16, 1654. Among the more important additions to the library in printed books is an extra-illustrated edition of Sandham's *Ville Marie* in six volumes, completed by Mr. Sandham shortly before his death. A local enthusiast in Peterborough, Ontario, has compiled from the newspapers of the city and county a record of the chief events that have happened since the birth of the town. This record has been bound in book form and deposited in the reference department of the public library.

Bibliographies, Guides, and Calendars

An index to volumes 11-20 of the *Review of historical publications relating to Canada*, compiled by L. Mason, has been published by the University of Toronto. The *Review*, which did not appear last year for financial and other reasons, has been resumed this year, the current volume covering historical publications of the years 1917 and 1918. The Geographic board of Canada has issued a *Catalogue of the maps in the collection of the Geographic board*, accompanied by a *Graphical index* in twelve sheets.

Historical and other bibliographies and similar tools for lightening the labor of students have apparently been classed among the forbidden luxuries during the period of the war. Extremely few of these most useful appliances have seen print in Canada since 1914. G. C. Davidson's admirable thesis on *The North West company*, mentioned elsewhere in this survey, contains a selected bibliography of printed and manuscript material relating to the history of the company. Volume xix of the *Collections* of the Nova Scotia historical society contains a list of papers read before the society, 1878-1917, and a list of the *Collections*, volumes i to xix.

Publication of Source Material

The board of historical publications, established in connection with the Canadian archives, as noted in last year's survey, has already laid the foundation for some exceedingly useful work. At the 1919 meeting of the Royal society of Canada, Mr. Adam Shortt, chairman of the board, discussed at some length the plans of the board so far as they had already been formulated. The general object is to bring within reach of students of history, within and without Canada, teachers in schools and universities, public and professional men, and the reading public generally, the chief documents relating to the history of Canada, interpreted in its broadest sense. These documents will of course be arranged in the most convenient form for consultation and adequately equipped with editorial commentary and indexes. Here as elsewhere the actual work of publication has been delayed by considerations growing out of the war, but it is now hoped to make some progress during the present year.

The new edition of *Documents relating to the constitutional history of Canada* is in press and will, it is expected, soon be ready for distribution. A new *Canadian archives report* is also in press. Among other articles of interest it will contain a complete set of official proclamations, public notices, and the like of the military government (1760-1764) for the districts of Montreal and Trois Rivières, and as complete a set as can be obtained of those of the district of Quebec. The Quebec proclamations of this era have unfortunately been lost and all now in existence are such individual copies as have been preserved in London, in the St. Sulpice library, Montreal, in Laval university, and elsewhere. The report will also contain the public proclamations issued in Canada for 1764-1791, and a completion of the calendar of the Neilson papers, the first part of which was given in the *Canadian archives report* for 1913. The portion of the calendar now issued covers the years 1824 to 1847.

The fourteenth report of the bureau of archives of the province of Ontario contains a first installment of the records of the early courts of Upper Canada, now Ontario. They cover the years 1789-1794, and are of very considerable historical interest. The documents are accompanied by a preface in which the pro-

vincial archivist tells the rather dramatic story of how they were accidentally discovered in 1910, after having been given up for years as irrecoverably lost; and also a scholarly introduction contributed by Justice Riddell. The story of the finding of the documents is one to gladden the heart of every historical student. "In the summer of 1910," says Mr. Fraser, "Mr. C. M. Burton, of Detroit, a public-spirited investigator of the history of the State of Michigan, and especially of the early days of Detroit, called on me in Toronto and expressed a desire to see the vaults at Osgoode Hall, the home of the High Courts of Ontario. Mr. Burton had asked me before this time to enquire at Osgoode Hall for the records of the Court of Common Pleas for the District of Hesse, or the Western District, which at one time included Detroit. The records had been sought for years in like and unlikely places, including Osgoode Hall, but could not be found. At his request, I repeated the enquiry, but the oldest of the officials, for fifty-one years the custodian of the oldest vault, knew nothing of them, and stated that two systematic searches at the request of the Attorney General's Office had been made many years before without avail.

"Mr. Burton's immediate object on the occasion of his visit, however, was to observe the method in use for filing papers preserved. At that time there were no electric lights in the vaults, and lamps were forbidden because of the possibility of accidental explosion. The languid flame of a tallow candle sufficed to show the way, though not to shed sufficient light on the dust-begrimed pigeonholes. Mr. Burton noticed a book of ancient appearance on the top shelf that aroused his curiosity. To get it for him, I climbed on an uncovered deal box filled with old papers that lay on the floor, and reached the volume. The book proved to be one into which letters of the early 'eighties had been copied by letter press—of no apparent record value. Stepping down I upset the deal box, emptying the contents on the floor. Proceeding to replace the papers, the first article picked up was a paper-covered volume similar to the old-fashioned books sometimes used by the township valuators of long ago. My astonishment may be imagined when I discovered that the book was one of the long lost Minute Books of the Court of Common Pleas of the Western District, and there on the first

page was the name of the 'First Judge,' the Honourable Wm. Dummer Powell. Mr. Burton and Mr. Jackson were standing near me in the narrow vault, the latter holding the candle and telling the Detroit visitor of the age and glory of Osgoode Hall. I suppressed my rising feelings until all the papers had been put back in the box except eight thin folios, one after another of which I had rescued from the orderless heap, tattered, and apparently useless, but in reality of priceless value, being the original records of our oldest constituted Courts for the old Districts of Hesse, Mecklenburg and Luneburg in Upper Canada.

"I asked Mr. Burton to look at one of the books, remarking that he might feel interested in it. He opened it, and when he saw the holograph of John Munro, a relative, on one of the pages he gave up the effort to appear calm, and in the circumstances was to be excused for having always known that the precious records were there."

In an interesting note by Fred Landon on "Father Jones and the Jesuit archives" in the July, 1918, number of the *Michigan history magazine* there are references to a few of the invaluable documents relating to early Canadian history in the archives of St. Mary's college, Montreal. Of one of these Mr. Landon says: "The linguistic writings of Father Pierre Potier who died at the Sandwich Mission on the Detroit River in 1781 are among the treasures of these Jesuit archives. There are five volumes all in the neat handwriting of Father Potier. The first two contain the Huron radicals or roots of the five conjugations, the third volume is a Huron grammar and compendium, the fourth a collection of sermons and homilies in the Huron tongue while the fifth volume is made up of the two previous volumes of Huron roots with many additions and a list of some 566 nouns in the order of the conjugations to which they belong. It may not be generally known that the Ontario Bureau of Archives is planning to reproduce these volumes in photo-facsimile." The provincial archivist states that these documents will appear in the forthcoming *Report of the Ontario archives.* In addition to the facsimile of the manuscripts there will be published Wilkie's *Analysis*, several contributions on the same subject from other sources, and a sketch of Father Potier's life. Mr. Fraser states

that during the year considerable progress has been made by the bureau of archives in the copying of official documents which it is hoped will some day see the light, the compilation of the Doomsday book, and the assembling and classification of much material, pictorial and otherwise, connected with the great war. Some attention has been given to the subject of place names and genealogy under the direction of the bureau of archives. The year has been a very busy one and much good work has been accomplished.

Among the papers read at the May meeting of the Royal society of Canada were several that should be noted in this section. To the English section were contributed two western narratives, edited by Judge Howay, of New Westminster, British Columbia. The first, "Overland journey of the argonauts of 1862," describes the trials and adventures of the emigrants of that year on their memorable journey across the continent to British Columbia. The second, "The voyage of the *Hope*, 1790-1792," contains an account of the voyage of one of the early Boston ships to the northwest coast of America, in the days of the maritime fur trade. Walter S. Herrington contributed "Some notes on the minutes of the town meetings of the township of Sidney," based on an old minute book of considerable historical interest, covering the period 1790-1850. Justice Riddell, one of the most indefatigable of Canadian historical investigators, read two papers, the first, "The slave in Upper Canada," bringing together the documentary evidence as to the existence of slavery in what is now known as Ontario; and the second, "A contemporary account of the Navy island episode, 1837," consisting of a narrative by George Coventry of the destruction of the *Caroline*, with introduction and historical notes. Of papers contributed to the French section, mention may be made here of "Sur un journal inédit du siège de Québec en 1759," by Aegidius Fauteux; and "Les oisivetéz de M. de Vauban," by A. D. DeCelles, librarian of parliament.

Publication of source material by the provincial archives of Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and other provinces except Ontario, has been held up during the war. It is probable, however, that steps will be taken within the next year or so to make accessible in printed form much of the valuable documentary

material contained in these repositories. Much the same condition obtains with the provincial and local historical societies, which exist in all the provinces but are particularly numerous and active in Ontario. Volume XVI of the *Papers and records* of the Ontario historical society contains an address by Henry Harmon Noble, on "A loyalist of the St. Lawrence," an account, largely drawn from documents in the Canadian archives, of the building of Loyal block house, Block House Point, Vermont, in 1781, by Captain Justus Sherwood. J. D. Barnett's paper, "The books of the political prisoners and exiles of 1838," although made up largely of extracts from rare printed books by men who took part in the rebellion in Upper Canada, perhaps may be properly included here. The Lennox and Addington historical society continues in volume X of its *Papers and records* the excellent work it has been doing for some time past in the publication of records relating to the history of the county. "The newspapers of the county" consists of an historical survey of the newspapers of Lennox and Addington, in the form of extracts from the old files. The volume is compiled and edited by Walter S. Herrington, of Napanee.

In this section may also be noted source material published in periodicals, such as T. C. Elliott's carefully edited extracts from the diaries of David Thompson, of the North West company, "David Thompson's journeys in the Spokane country," begun in the July, 1917, number of the *Washington historical quarterly*, and concluded in January, 1919. In the *Bulletin des recherches historiques* appeared the following: "Memoire sur les limites du Canada," a document signed by Dumas and dated at Paris, April 5, 1761; "Une ordonnance inédite sur Montréal," by E. Z. Massicotte; and "Les ordonnances des six premiers intendants de la Nouvelle France," by Pierre-Georges Roy. Several books consisting mainly of source material will be noted under the division of monographs and general treatises.

Meetings and Published Transactions

The Royal society of Canada held its thirty-seventh annual meeting in Ottawa, May 19-22, 1919. Several papers of an historical nature were read before sections I and II, in addition to those mentioned under the preceding heading. To the former,

Pierre-Georges Roy contributed a study of "Louis Rouer de Villeray, premier conseiller au conseil souverain de la Nouvelle-France." The same industrious scholar also read a paper on "Jean-Baptiste-Louis Franquelin, hydrographe du roi à Québec." Gustave Lanctôt, in "Les premiers volontaires au Canada," tells the story of five companies of French-Canadian volunteers in the campaign of 1764 against Pontiac. Benjamin Sulte, in "Pierre Ducalvet," discusses the historical value, or rather the lack of historical value, of the writings of a man who managed to keep himself very much in the limelight in the period 1775-1783. A slight paper by Régis Roy discusses the question, "Jacques Cartier, appartenait-il à la noblesse?" Two contributions to the ecclesiastical history of Quebec are Abbé Auclair's "Les Soeurs de Sainte-Anne à Saint-Jacques et à Lachine," and Monseigneur Paquet's "Nos évêques d'après leur historien." Before the English section, Archdeacon Raymond read a paper, "A loyalist and a radical," on Elias Hardy, a well-known figure in the early days of New Brunswick. Two economic papers of unusual interest were Stephen Leacock's "Position and outlook of political economy," and Dr. MacIver's "Economic foundations of society." Several papers coming rather within the province of ethnology will be noted later. The Royal society volume for 1918, containing papers noted in last year's survey, was issued in May last.

Among the publications of Canadian historical societies published since the appearance of the last survey, may be noted the *Annual report* of the Ontario historical society (Toronto), for 1918, and volume xvi of the *Papers and records of* the same society; the *Sixth annual report* of the Waterloo historical society (Kitchener, Ontario); volume iv of the *Papers and addresses* of the Kent historical society (Chatham, Ontario); the *Ninth annual report* of the Thunder Bay historical society (Port Arthur, Ontario); the *Annual report* of the Women's Canadian historical society of Ottawa for 1918-1919; the *Annual report* of the Woman's Canadian historical society of Toronto for 1918; number 31 of the *Publications* of the Niagara historical society (Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario); volume ix of the *Transactions* of the London and Middlesex historical society (London, Ontario); number 7 of the *Pioneer papers* of the Sim-

coe county pioneer and historical society (Barrie, Ontario); two pamphlets issued by the Essex county historical society (Windsor, Ontario); volume XIX of the *Collections* of the Nova Scotia historical society; and the *Annual report* of the York pioneer and historical society (Toronto). In addition to the papers already noted in the *Papers and records* of the Ontario historical society may be mentioned John Squair's presidential address, without specific title, but dealing with the early history of the temperance movement in Durham county, Ontario; "The latest milestones in the history of civilization," by Lieutenant-Colonel A. E. Belcher, a paper read before the York pioneer and historical society; "The Rev. John Barclay, M. A.," by A. Blanche Burt; "History of the Windsor and Detroit ferries," by F. J. Holton, D. H. Bedford, and Francis Cleary; and "The founding of Kirkfield," by A. F. Hunter.

At the last meeting of the Ontario historical society, in June, 1919, the following papers were read: "The retreat of Proctor and Tecumseh," by Judge Ermatinger; "History of Presbyterianism in Oxford county," by the Reverend McMullen; "Women in pioneer life," by Amelia Poldon; "Leaves from an unpublished volume," by George R. Pattullo; "Canadian history in the schools," by H. J. Cody; "The Six Nation Indians," by A. I. Gilkison; "The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of western Ontario by La Salle and the Sulpician priests," by J. H. Coyne; "Stage days in Oxford," by W. B. Hobson; "Former name of the River Thames," by James Sinclair; "The Amishman," by Judge Smith; "Early days in Waterloo county," by W. H. Breithaupt; "Williamstown, an historic village," by Janet Carnochan; "Some unusual sources of information in the Toronto public library on the history of the rebellion of 1837-1838," by Frances Staton; and "Canada's part in freeing the slave," by Fred Landon.

Of papers read before the various local societies may be mentioned: E. W. B. Snider's historical account of the industrial development of Waterloo county, and Carlton McNaught's paper on "Hon. James Young: Canadian patriot," (Waterloo historical society); R. V. Bray's "Medical profession in Chatham and Kent counties: a history," G. T. McKeough's "Early Indian occupation of Kent county," W. N. Sexsmith's "Notes

on the Buxton settlement," and A. A. Hicks' "Growth of Methodism in Chatham" (Kent historical society); "Early mining," by Peter McKellar (Thunder Bay historical society); and "The new settlement on Lake Erie," by George F. Macdonald (Essex historical society). Three papers read before the York pioneer and historical society in 1919 but not yet published are: A. E. S. Smythe's "Early pioneers in book-making in Canada"; Dr. Keyes' "Impressions of a boy in Toronto fifty years ago"; and H. J. Cody's "Historical societies." Two useful papers were read at the meeting of the Nova Scotia historical society in May, 1919: "A summary of certain letters in the Dominion archives relating to the Acadian expulsion, 1751-1756," by Placide Gaudet; and "Notes from an old ledger at Arichat, Cape Breton," by J. F. Blagdon. Other papers read this year before local historical societies are: "Genesis of place names," by Louis Goulet and "Settlement and survey of the River Thames lots," by W. G. George (Kent historical society); "Social life among the Indians of James bay," by P. H. Godsell (Thunder Bay historical society); "Exploration of southern Ontario," by J. H. Coyne; "The exiles of 1837-1838," by J. D. Barnet; "Fugitive slaves in London before 1860," by Fred Landon; "Durham's work in Canada," by J. D. Barnet; "Pioneer settlers of Adelaide township," by Harold C. Rennie; and "More Proudfoot papers," by H. Priddis (London and Middlesex historical society).

There seems to be no immediate prospect of the revival of the Manitoba historical society, which has now been in a state of suspended animation for several years. For a quarter of a century or more, under the leadership of George Bryce, the western Canadian historian, and a small group of enthusiastic associates, this society did excellent work under conditions that were far from encouraging, and published a number of small but important annual volumes, many of which are now among the rarities of Canadian historical literature. Another society that has for some years been counted among the dead with no apparent hope of resurrection is the Peterborough historical society (Ontario). As in so many cases, this society was for some time kept alive mainly through the enthusiasm of one or two members, and when death or physical infirmities or other and more pressing responsibilities removed these, the society collapsed.

Periodical Literature

In the *Canadian magazine* (Toronto), Sir John Willison continued and concluded his series, "Reminiscences political and personal." Other articles of an historical nature are: W. S. Wallace's "First Canadian agent in London"; V. Hayward's "The Doukhobours: a community race in Canada"; Vicomte de Fronsac's "The last royal governor of Gaspesia"; Justice Riddell's "Marriage in early Upper Canada"; L. Stone's "St. Eustache; some incidents of its defence and its defenders in 1837"; and "Indians of the county of Simcoe" by David Williams.

Queen's quarterly (Kingston, Ontario) has printed "Sir Wilfrid Laurier," by A. Kirk Cameron; and "A forgotten adventurer of the fur trade," by L. J. Burpee.

The *University magazine* (Montreal) has published: "The Canadian anti-slavery group," by Fred Landon; "Our future in the British empire," by J. G. Harvey; "Federation or empire," by Arthur E. Darby; and "The fugitive slave in Canada," by F. Landon.

The *Bulletin des recherches historiques* (Beauceville, Quebec) has offered the following: "Le projet de conquête de la Nouvelle-York de M. de Callières en 1689," by Pierre-Georges Roy; "Nicolas de Mouchy, notaire royal à Montreal," by E. Z. Massicotte; "La seigneurie de Cap Saint-Claude," by Pierre-Georges Roy; "Notes historiques sur le nord de la province de Québec, la Baie d'Hudson, l'Ungava," by Hormisdas Magnau; "Les compagnons de Cartier," by Régis Roy.

Le Canada Français (Quebec) has published: "Les débuts de notre régime parlementaires. La question de langue," by Thomas Chapais; "La déportation des Acadiens," by Henri d'Arlas; "Acadiana. Mgr. M. F. Richard," by F. M. Gildas; "A propos des frères la Vérendrye," by A. H. de Trémaudan; "Pierre Gauthier de Varennes de la Vérendrye et ses fils," by Abbé Caron; "Le Duc de Kent à Québec en 1791," by Abbé Auguste Gosselin. It may be noted that *Le Canada Français,* of which the first two volumes have now appeared—the first number appearing in September, 1918—replaces *Parler Français.* The new magazine is edited by Abbé Camille Roy, and published by Laval university, Quebec.

In the *Revue Canadienne* (Montreal), Pierre-Georges Roy continues his series of articles, "Les officiers d'état-major sous le régime Français." Other articles to be noted are: "Au berceau de la confédération," by Emile Chartier; "Sir Wilfrid Laurier," by Elie J. Auclair; and "Critique de l'histoire de l'Acadie Françoise de M. Moreau," by A. Couillard Després.

Le Pays Laurentien (Montreal) has published two articles of special note: "Les Dieskau," by F. J. Audet; and "Au berceau de la confédération," by Antonio Savard. Of a number of articles by Benjamin Sulte, the following should be mentioned: "Washington et le Canada," "Enfance d'une législature," "Hochelaga," and "Questions d'histoire." Régis Roy contributes some historical notes on Charnisay and De Louvigny.

During the period under review a good many articles have appeared in periodicals outside Canada bearing on Canadian history. Of these may be mentioned: "Father Jones and the Jesuit archives," by Fred Landon, and "Claude Jean Allouez," by John A. Lemmer, in *Michigan history magazine,* July and October, 1918, respectively; "Political biography in Canada," by W. P. M. Kennedy, in the *Bookman,* May, 1919; "Mennonite problem in Canada," by J. A. Stevenson, *Nation,* November 9, 1918; "Excursion into Canadian history," by C. W. Gordon, *Bookman,* November, 1918; "Confederation of British America," by A. H. Chute, *North American review,* October, 1918; "Political situation in Canada," by C. A. C. Jennings, *Edinburgh review,* July, 1918; "Quebec's disaffection," by P. T. McGrath, *Review of reviews,* July, 1918; "Political situation in Canada," by R. M. Dawson, *New republic,* January 12, 1918.

Mention may be made here of that admirable annual, the *Canadian annual review of public affairs*; the volume for 1918, edited by J. Castell Hopkins, was published some time ago.

Monographs and General Treatises

It is not often that a living historian enjoys the distinction of having his scattered writings brought together and published in a series of volumes. A case in point is the series, *Mélanges historiques de Benjamin Sulte, compilées, annotées et publiées par Gérard Malchelosse.* Three volumes have already been

published, in admirable form. Mr. Sulte has thrown light on so many obscure points in the early history of Canada, and his articles have appeared in so many more or less casual and inaccessible magazines and newspapers, that M. Malchelosse's work is one for which all historical students interested in this subject must be devoutly thankful.

The death of the great Canadian statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has not yet brought forth anything like an adequate biography, although two at least are in preparation. Among several rather superficial sketches published since his death are Peter McArthur's *Sir Wilfrid Laurier*; *Sir Wilfrid Laurier: a tribute*, compiled by T. A. Browne; and the articles by A. Kirk Cameron, in *Queen's quarterly*, and by E. J. Auclair in the *Revue Canadienne* elsewhere mentioned. What will probably be the standard lives of the former prime minister of Canada, in French and English respectively, are now in preparation by the veteran French-Canadian scholar and lifelong friend of Laurier, Senator David, and by O. D. Skelton, of Queen's university, respectively. The former work, it is understood, will be accompanied by a collection of Sir Wilfrid's speeches and will probably fill two large volumes. The latter will be somewhat more compact. A recent pamphlet that may properly be mentioned here is Ferdinand Rinfret's *Le Liberalism de Laurier.* The biography of Sir Georges-Etienne Cartier, by John Boyd, has now been translated into French by Sylva Clapin and published in Montreal. Sir Joseph Pope, who wrote the authorized biography of his former chief Sir John A. Macdonald, published some years ago, has now completed the editing of Macdonald's letters. They will be published by the Oxford press, probably in two volumes.

Two important contributions to Canadian constitutional history are W. P. M. Kennedy's *Documents of the Canadian constitution, 1729-1915*, and A. D. DeCelles' *Les constitutions du Canada.* Mr. Kennedy's work is exceptionally useful, as it contains not merely what are usually regarded as constitutional documents, but also much illustrative material in the way of contemporary speeches, letters, and the like, not hitherto readily accessible. In *Selected speeches and documents of British*

colonial policy, Arthur B. Keith has brought together in compact form a series of documents on fundamental decisions of British colonial policy, from the royal proclamation of 1763 dealing with the constitution of Canada, to the decisions of the imperial war cabinet in 1917. Another useful book in the same field is W. S. Scott's *Canadian constitution historically explained.*

Francis Maseres was attorney-general of Canada from 1766 to 1769, three very critical years in Canadian history. His letters to friends in England not only give a vivid picture of Canada in those years, but also throw much light on obscure passages in the politics of the period. They are now published as *The Maseres letters, 1766-1768*,[2] with introduction, notes, and appendixes, under the editorship of W. Stewart Wallace of Toronto university.

The monograph referred to in last year's survey, *Journal de l'expedition du Chevalier de Troyes à la Baie d'Hudson en 1686*, by Abbé Ivanhoe Caron, has since been published. A book praiseworthy both as a scholarly piece of work and as an example of good bookmaking is J. S. McLennan's *Louisbourg from its foundation to its fall, 1713-1758.* This book was printed in the spring of 1914, but was held over on account of the war and not actually published until the autumn of 1918. It is based on original and to a large extent hitherto unpublished material in the Canadian archives and elsewhere. A modest little work that throws a good deal of new light on the early history of the Canadian capital, then known as Bytown, is H. P. Hill's *Robert Randall and the LeBreton flats.* Other recent publications are: Hugh S. Eayrs, *"Sir Isaac Brock*; W. S. Herrington's *Pioneer life amongst the loyalists of Upper Canada*; R. G. MacBeth's *Romance of western Canada*; R. E. Gosnell, *Story of confederation*; E. Porritt, *Evolution of the Dominion of Canada*; two volumes in the Chronicles of America series: W. B. Munro, *Crusaders of New France*, and G. M. Wrong, *Conquest of New France*[3]; *Sir George Arthur and his administration in Upper Canada*, by Walter Sage; *Early days of Dunneville*, by P. J. Donovan;

[2] To be reviewed later.

[3] To be reviewed later.

One year of union government, by N. W. Rowell; *Les premiers colons du Canada*, by Abbé Couillard-Desprès. Sir John Willison's "Reminiscences," which have been appearing serially in the *Canadian magazine*, will be published this autumn under the title *Across the years*. Another book that will be published about the same time is L. J. Burpee's *Fur traders of the west*, which was originally announced for publication in 1916 but was delayed owing to the war. Among publications of the Dominion government of a more or less historical character may be mentioned the *Report of the commission appointed to delimit the boundary between the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia*; *Description of and guide to Jasper park, with historical notes by R. Douglas*, edited by E. Deville, surveyor-general; and a pamphlet entitled *Canada's war effort, 1914-1918*, issued by the director of public information.

Several recent books that attempt in various ways to apply the lessons of the past to the great problem of reconstruction in Canada are C. W. Peterson's *Wake up, Canada*; Arthur Hawkes' *The Birthright*, a search for the Canadian Canadian and a plea for the larger loyalty; William H. Moore's *The clash: a study in nationalities*, dealing mainly with the racial question in Canada[4]; W. L. Mackenzie King's *Industry and humanity*; J. D. Hunt's *Dawn of a new patriotism*; and L. J. Burpee's *A successful experiment in international relations*.

The *Canada year book*, 1918, issued by the Dominion government as a Jubilee volume, contains some useful historical material, notably Sir Joseph Pope's "The story of confederation," and Ernest H. Godfrey's "Chronological history of Canada, 1497-1918," and "Fifty years of Canadian progress, 1867-1917."

The most noteworthy doctoral dissertation relating to Canadian history published during the last twelve months is Gordon Charles Davidson's *The North West company*, issued as volume VII of the *Publications in history* of the University of California.[5] It may be interesting to note that Mr. Davidson saw service overseas as a lieutenant in the Canadian mounted rifles, and incidentally dug to some purpose among the old fur trade

[4] To be reviewed later.

[5] To be reviewed later.

documents in the public record office and elsewhere in England. Among the doctoral dissertations in history now in progress at the chief American universities are several that have a bearing on Canadian history: "History of the Canadian Pacific railway," by Harold Innis; "Sir William Johnson and Anglo-American Indian policy, 1743-1754," by J. A. Hofto; "A critical study of the plans which have been advanced for the federation of the British empire," by L. A. Mills; "Trade relations of Canada with the United States," by E. C. Bancroft; "The diplomatic and military activities of Canada, 1861-1865, as affected by the American civil war," by W. F. Raney; "Newfoundland as a fishery, 1600-1750," by A. G. Dorland.

Marking of Historic Sites

The *Annual report* of the Historic landmarks association of Canada, 1919, and the report of the historic sites and monuments committee in the *Annual report* of the Ontario historical society, 1918, record continued progress in the good work that has been undertaken in connection with the preservation of buildings associated with the history of Canada and the marking of historic sites throughout the Dominion. The Historic landmarks association's report contains an annotated list of "Historic sites in Canada and Newfoundland and some war memorials."

Ethnological and Archaeological Work

The division of anthropology of the geological survey of Canada has continued its work under somewhat adverse conditions during the last twelve months. The new parliament buildings at Ottawa being still incomplete, a large part of the Victoria museum is occupied by the house of commons and senate and their numerous officials, and the ethnological and archaeological exhibits are for the most part packed away until space is again available in the museum. It is hoped that parliament will move into its own building next year, and it will then be possible to resume the normal activities of the museum.

In September, 1918, the division of anthropology collaborated with the department of Indian affairs in providing a special exhibit of Indian handicrafts, aboriginal and educational, for

the Central Canada exhibition. The anthropological part of this exhibit consisted of a Canadian Sioux ornamented tepee, a number of Thompson river and Iroquois mats, and a Sioux cradle board. These specimens formed a background for a number of Abenaki basketmakers from Pierreville, Quebec, who demonstrated their native art.

The field work undertaken by the division is still hampered by economies enforced by the war, but it is hoped that next season it may be possible to resume these activities on the scale reached before 1915. The urgency of the resumption of field work in Canadian anthropology is, of course, accentuated by the fact that the old Indian cultures are fast passing, even as memories among the old men. Mr. E. Sapir was mainly occupied during the past twelve months with the preparation of a series of southern Paiute and Uintah Ute texts, with translations and copious annotations, to be published in the anthropological series of the museum of the University of Pennsylvania. This material may be considered as ancillary to the exhaustive grammatical study of southern Paiute completed last year and intended to form part of the *Handbook of American Indian languages* issued, under the editorship of Franz Boas, by the Bureau of American ethnology. A number of smaller papers, of a linguistic or ethnological nature, were also prepared for publication in various journals. Among these may be mentioned a paper on the kinship system of the Kutenai Indians of British Columbia, and one on the religion of the Nootka Indians of Vancouver island.

Mr. C. M. Barbeau has concentrated his efforts largely on further study and organization of Canadian folklore. As a result of his last year's survey in Temiscouata and Gaspé counties, Quebec, he has added to the folk material in the anthropological division over 1200 folk songs, 64 folk dances for instruments, 17 long folk tales, 28 anecdotes bearing on folkloristic beliefs, 280 photographs of objects illustrating folk ethnography, and extensive notes on various related topics. The folk songs, tales, and the like, are in the form of phonograph records. Mr. E. Z. Massicotte continued his researches in the folklore of the Montreal district, collecting a series of about 700 folk songs for

the division. In addition to the volume of Ontario and Shetlandic folklore published as one of the 1918 numbers of the *Journal of American folk-lore* for 1918, as noted in last year's survey, another installment of French-Canadian folklore, collected by Mr. Massicotte and edited by Mr. Barbeau, appeared in the last number for 1918 of the same journal.

Mr. D. Jenness, the anthropologist of the Canadian arctic expedition, who was absent on military service overseas from the middle of 1917 to the beginning of 1919, while unable to complete for publication before he left Canada all the manuscript data collected among the Alaskan and Copper Eskimo, left in finished form a substantial portion, embracing Eskimo folklore including texts, a paper on Eskimo cat's cradles, some of the chapters of the general report on the Copper Eskimo, and a preliminary treatment of the physical anthropology of the Copper Eskimo, including tables of measurements. The publication of this and other anthropological material will, it is hoped, be arranged for in time to be noted in the next survey.

Mr. Harlan I. Smith, the archaeologist of the geological survey, has managed to continue his field work in British Columbia, and during the winter months continued his very practical work in the collection and arrangement of prehistoric designs, for the benefit of Canadian manufacturers and artists. He has been spending the season of 1919 in a fairly extensive bit of archaeological work in Queen Charlotte islands, the results of which will be reported next year.

It may be noted at the same time that Mr. W. J. Wintemberg, another member of the division of anthropology, is taking up archaeological work in southwestern Ontario; and Mr. F. W. Waugh is at work on ethnological research among the Ojibwa Indians at Lac Seul, Ontario.

Several papers contributed to this year's transactions of the Royal society of Canada may be noted here: "Lord Lovel and Lady Nancy; a traditional ballad," by W. J. Wintemberg; "Legends of Long Point," by J. H. Coyne; "Carmel, une légende de la tribu des Cris," by Judge Prud'homme; "Le pardon des ajoncs d'or en Bretagne," by Abbé Camille Roy; "Les 'mi-carêmes' au Lac Saint-Jean," by Ernest Bilodeau; "Anecdotes du

terroir,'' by Jules Tremblay; and ''Légendes et anecdotes de l'Islet,'' by J. E. A. Cloutier. The Ontario *Archaeological report* for 1918 contains a number of interesting articles and archaeological notes. One may note also an article on ''Le folklore canadien,'' by Victor Morin, in *Le Pays Laurentien.*

Lawrence J. Burpee

Ottawa, Canada

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Frontier Officer's Military Order Book[1]

Colonel Henry Dodge's "Military order book" is a manuscript volume containing his orders concerning operations which touch about eight present states of the Mississippi valley. The years embraced in these activities cover the period from 1832 to 1836. The document, which is at present in the possession of the Iowa historical department at Des Moines, may be discussed in three parts: the orders of General Winfield Scott to Dodge in 1832; some of Major Dodge's military correspondence as commanding officer of the United States rangers; and his orders as colonel of the first United States dragoons from April, 1833, to March, 1836, which constitute about seven-eighths of the volume.

General Winfield Scott, commanding the northwestern army, was located in the summer of 1832 at Fort Armstrong, at that time garrisoned by forty-three troops. The order book preserves his orders relating to reports, the care of the sick, the disposal of camp equipments, and sanitary regulations. The cholera, which was then raging in the United States, visited the ranger camp and more stringent precautions were advised. The intemperance among the soldiers, the general pointed out, generated and spread the calamity. It was ordered, therefore, that every soldier or ranger who should be found drunk or sensibly intoxicated was to be compelled "to dig a grave at a suitable burying place, large enough for his own reception, as such grave cannot fail soon to be wanted for the drunken man himself, or some drunken companion." This, the order concluded, was not only to serve for the punishment of drunkenness but also "to spare good and temperate men the labour of digging graves for their worthless companions."

[1] This paper was read before the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at St. Louis, May 8, 1919.

By April, 1833, Major Dodge had issued instructions to the rangers. Captain Jesse B. Browne was ordered to march to Danville, Illinois, and to camp there for the winter. Later in that month, however, both Captain Browne and Captain Benjamin V. Beekes were instructed to march to Hennepin on the Illinois river, where the Winnebago Indians were assuming a threatening aspect. The recollections of the Black Hawk war of the previous year intensified the rumors of Indian outbreaks among the scattered frontier settlements.

In order number eighteen are contained the directions of General Scott for the disposition of the rangers over the northwestern frontier. The companies of Captains Henry, Beekes, and Jesse B. Browne were to range the frontiers between the Wabash, the Chicago, and the Wisconsin rivers under the immediate instructions of Major Dodge. Care was to be exercised by Major Dodge to winter at places where grain and forage could be obtained. The other three companies were to receive their orders from the western department of the army, but in the meantime Captain Nathan Boone and Captain Ford were ordered to march to Fort Gibson.

A special order prescribed the paroles and countersigns for the week beginning September 7, 1833. "Caesar" was to be answered by the countersign "Gaul"; "Hannibal" by "Capua"; "Saladin" by "Palestine"; "Hamlet" by "Denmark"; and "Napoleon" by "Corsica." Another order directed that all persons should be in their tents at 8:30 P. M., the hour which completed the daily routine of camp life at Fort Armstrong.

Serious discontent arose in June, 1833, among the rangers. The men who had enlisted for twelve months contended that their terms of service would expire one year from their enlistment and not a year from the date of their mustering into the army. On July 7, forty-two disgruntled soldiers appeared before Captain Beekes, their commander, stacked their arms in front of his tent, mounted their horses, and started for Indiana. Only about twenty-four men of the company remained and the ranger colonel here recorded that "Capt. Beekes Applied To Me for a Furlough to return to Indiana[.] he has had a Severe Attack of the Rheumatic pains and is at present unfit for Service."

A glimpse of a dragoon company's equipment is given in an order of July 12, 1833, in which Lieutenant C. F. M. Noland was directed to list "Every discription of public property belonging to the Company of Capt. Beekes Consisting of Tents Swords Pistols Holsters Catridge Belts Boxes & Flasks as well as Waggons Public Horses Axes spades Scythes Camp Kettles ovens & pans." In 1834 Colonel Dodge received notice of the shipment of 360 carbines, bayonets, percussion caps, and the necessary molds for making ball and buckshot.

Official ordnance reports for 1834, however, presented a more varied picture of the dragoon regiment's arms. Here are listed 597 pistols, 398 carbines, 582 cavalry sabers, 13 unserviceable carbines, and 552 cartridge boxes. Company A possessed 21 gun slings, 28 wipers, 74 shoulder sword belts, 75 belt plates, and 72 holsters.[2]

Two years later Colonel Dodge appraised the dragoon arms and equipment. The carbines were satisfactory, but the complicated mechanism required that a very exact charge of powder be used to prevent bursting of the stocks. The pistols were of a good model and weight for the dragoon service. He regarded the swords as made of good metal and believed that the scabbards would preserve the blades from the weather. He further asked that a circular metal box be furnished to contain the carbine percussion caps. The holster cases were too small; the saddles, while of a good model, were of inferior workmanship and leather. The stirrups were satisfactory but the bits had too much weight of metal and injured the mouths of the horses. "I would recommend that the Present Dragoon Bridles be dispensed with as entirely Unsuited to the Service, the Spurs are good, and the Saddle Bags are suited to the Service." Again in 1836 he recommended changes in equipment: the grazing lines should be made of hair and should be made twenty feet in length; the pads for the dragoon saddles became too heavy on long expeditions and often had to be thrown away. "The Indians," he observed, "Seldom Have anything under their saddles but Blanketts or Skins and they seldom Hurt there Horses Backs."

Quartermasters of today might discover startlingly low costs

[2] *American state papers: military affairs*, 5: 908.

in the more picturesque dragoon clothing of eighty-five years ago. Privates' woolen overalls cost $4.03 and the cotton overalls $1.11. The dragoon greatcoat was sold for $9.44 and the sergeants' cloth jackets for $4.99. The forage cap is put down at 87½ cents but the uniform caps with metal equipments for about four times that sum. Ornamented pieces such as bands, horsehair plumes, and brass shoulder knots cost respectively 60, 70, and 97 cents. The price of overalls and greatcoats, explained the commissary general of purchases, "appear to be very high, and is owing to the great quantity of materials used in them, being made shelavalie fashion and the greatcoats having a cape unusually large."[3]

Sometimes complaints over the slow and uncertain mails crept into the formal military correspondence of the dragoon commander. The mail to Fort Gibson came to Fort Leavenworth by way of St. Louis, a distance of nearly 800 miles, although the direct distance was not more than 300 miles. During the winter of 1834-1835 the monthly dragoon returns were on the way five or six weeks in coming from Fort Gibson to Colonel Dodge's quarters. About 200 miles toward the northeast, at Camp Des Moines, Lieutenant Kearny was stationed, and his reports of unfinished quarters and stables and of the unhealthful quarters traveled many weeks before they came to the commander's hands.

A story of the loss or disappearance of several hundred dragoon carbines is detailed in a letter of Colonel Dodge of April 2, 1835. Among military storekeepers, ordnance officers, wagoners, and company commanders it became difficult to account for the weapons. Were the guns in some ordnance depot, in some storehouse, at the botton of the Arkansas river, at Camp Jackson, or at Fort Leavenworth? Or had the company commanders made inaccurate ordnance accounts? Such were some of the vexatious questions which the colonel attempted to explain to the bureau officials at Washington.

Recruits for Colonel Dodge's regiment to replace those soldiers who had died or deserted or whose terms of enlistment had expired came from all parts of the union. In April, 1834, he

[3] *American state papers: military affairs*, 5: 235 ff.

reported the case of Private Russell, who apparently had been grossly deceived by Sergeant Treadway, the recruiting officer. The sergeant had even borrowed Russell's horse with the promise that it should be returned at Jefferson barracks. But neither sergeant nor steed ever appeared at that post. "He is a Man of infamous Character," complained the colonel, "a Man everyway calculated to deceive those with whom he had intercourse." He added, however, that had Russell been discharged on these alleged grounds of deception, there would have been fifty more applications urging the same reasons for discharge.

Preference was expressed for recruits from the western states because they were better acquainted with the care and management of horses. The dragoon colonel agreed with Captain Henry S. Turner, who believed that there were so many desertions in his company because part of the men "had been recruited in Boston, and part of them in the western Country which was the cause of disputes among his Men as their Habits and Manners Ware different and that he would prefer having his Company recruited in the same State." One can picture the contrasts in mental equipment, speech, education, and habits between Captain Sumner's dragoons from New York and the recruits from Missouri or the Tennessee mountains.

One dragoon recruit, a man of taste and education, has recorded what the formal order book omits to tell of the hardships and disappointments of the first contingents which came to Jefferson barracks in 1833. Assured that their military clothing would be in readiness at the barracks, the soldiers had left all surplus garments behind. But month after month passed and no forage caps were issued and no jackets or overalls had replaced the tattered garments of the sergeants, privates, or musicians. Dragoon cartridge boxes, holsters, saber belts, and arms likewise had not yet appeared at the post. Privates, sergeants, and corporals, wearying of the routine and hardships, deserted in large numbers. "Oppression every day growing more and more insupportable," declared one soldier, "the dragoons began openly to murmur, and the guard-house was kept continually filled to overflowing. Courts-martial were in continual session; and for the most trifling neglect of duty, men were tried and

sentenced either to walk the tow-path all day with a bag of shot on their shoulders, or to confinement in the guard-room." In one case a whole battalion was drawn up to witness the punishment of a deserter. Fifty successive lashes with a cat-'o-nine-tails were laid upon the victim's bare back. Salt and water were roughly applied to the bloody wounds and the victim was then consigned to the dreary walls of the guardhouse.[4]

There is a record of a mutiny at Fort Leavenworth, where some of the dragoons refused to obey orders to build stables. Captain Matthew Duncan's eight hundred mile march is mentioned and a detailed description of a sixteen hundred mile expedition to the Rockies is narrated by Colonel Dodge. Three dragoons were arrested for stealing; in October, 1835, the colonel explained how thirty-three books on cavalry tactics were lost or destroyed; on March 31, 1834, there was recorded the death of Lieutenant Bradford by the accidental discharge of a pistol while he was in pursuit of deserters. Elsewhere there is an account of an auction sale of the property of B. W. Ship, a dragoon who had but lately died in the service.

Lieutenant L. P. Lupton was placed under arrest for speaking improperly about President Andrew Jackson to "Western Respectable gentlemen and officers of the Govt." "I attribute," wrote Colonel Dodge, "the Most of the Difficulties Here to the intemperate use of Ardent Spirits." A few days later he wrote again: "The officers of this Regt are composed of Discordant Materials and it is true I on all occasions have done every thing in my power to produce Harmony and good feeling among them."

Drunkenness, charges and countercharges, courts-martial and disputes among the officers made up the unpleasant side of soldier life at Fort Leavenworth. In May, 1835, a general court-martial was in session to try Lieutenant James W. Hamilton and Captain Duncan, who were charged with having acted as second and principal in a duel. Lieutenant John L. Watson was accused of gross intoxication and of having while in that

[4] James Hildreth, *Dragoon campaigns to the Rocky mountains; being a history of the enlistment, organization, and first campaigns of the regiment of United States dragoons; together with the incidents of a soldier's life, and sketches of scenery and Indian character* (New York, 1836), 46 ff.

state permitted Private Russell to write the finding and sentence of a court-martial for which the officer was then acting as recorder. "The conduct of Mr. Watson," commented the colonel, "has been of the Most outrageous Character so Much so that I was Oblidged to order him from this post, or in the Guard House, his attack on the lawyer of the Post a few days ago and his gross indelicate Conduct towards the ladies Oblidged Me to Act." Even after his arrest and confinement in the guardhouse the colonel feared he would commit a breach of arrest. He expressed the hope that Lieutenant Watson's resignation would be accepted because the proceedings of a court-martial in his case would be "disreputable to the Army and particularly to the Corps I have the Honor to Command."

Only seldom did a note of tenderness from the dragoon colonel escape into his official military orders and reports. In September, 1834, however, he pleaded for surgeons for the one hundred men on his sick report and stated that four companies had marched from Fort Gibson to Fort Leavenworth, a distance of three hundred miles, without a surgeon. "The good of the Service and the lives of Many Men Ware at Stake." Another instance is in November, 1835, in the case of Lieutenant T. B. Wheelock, who upon resigning from the army requested a "Complementary letter" from his commander. "I Know he was dissapated and that his conduct in many respects was highly reprehensible[.] I was disposed to treat him generously as he Made a direct Appeal to my feelings and I was somewhat acquainted with the Nature of his Domestic troubles and he was the father of two promissing Children."

One seeks in vain in the order book for evidence of moral, religious, educational, or recreational work among the hundreds of soldiers located on and beyond the western frontiers. Elsewhere, however, it is stated that there were theatricals and a library at Fort Leavenworth. As late as 1831, at least, there were no chaplains in the western army and no ministers were present to give reproof and admonition during the life of these men, nor could the soldiers in death receive the consolations of religion. Neither did the honors of enlistment, service, and return of soldiers come generously from a safe democracy in 1835. The public, uninterested and uninformed in the duties of distant

garrisons, had little pride in the regular army of the United States. Newspapers quick to describe Indian wars or military duels saw little of interest in the work of the common soldier.

In 1835 the total military strength of the American republic was about 7200 men. Eighty-three years later—when the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918—the American army was more than five hundred and fourteen times as large. In the western department of the army in 1835 the 71 companies aggregating about 3500 men were scattered at 22 posts and performed their military functions over an irregular frontier extending about 1500 miles.[5]

Surely but unconsciously the fading pages of this old frontier officer's record depict in outline the tasks of the western army in the work of frontier defense, garrison duty, treaty negotiations, marches, expeditions, patrol duty, exploration, and the enforcement of federal laws. Such services influenced the westward drift of population, complementing the work of the explorers, the missionaries, the boatmen, the Indian traders, the surveyors, and the engineers.

The annals of our western posts have not yet become such romantic accounts as the tales that cling to Crown Point, Ticonderoga, or Pitt. Nor do military renown and glory follow our frontier soldiers over their western trails. But read aright by the historian, this "Military order book" compels homage and admiration for the thousands of plain, frontier soldiers for their quiet, unadorned, and often unheralded services, whether at lonely Mississippi river posts, in the protection of trade caravans, in travels over the cactus-covered plains, or in marches from post to post. There were few great names in our frontier army of eighty and ninety years ago, but the names of Dodge, Kearny, Buford, Sumner, and Boone are linked with the memories of a west that was yet young.

LOUIS PELZER

[5] *American state papers: military affairs*, 5: 635, 639.

BOOK REVIEWS

America and Britain. By Andrew Cunningham McLaughlin, A.M., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S. (New York: E. P. Dutton and company, 1919. 221 p. $2.00 net)

Mr. McLaughlin's mission to Great Britain in the spring of 1918, which was the occasion for the delivery of the addresses at the University of London and elsewhere which are here collected and published, was in a sense semiofficial. He and his companion, Mr. Charles Moore, were sent by the war-emergency National board for historical service in response to a request from the other side, as part of a movement for knitting closer the bonds between the two great English-speaking countries. It was natural that Mr. McLaughlin should take as his theme the relations of America and Britain, and it is in keeping with his character that he handles this theme tactfully but at the same time without sacrifice of historical truth or the American point of view. "I am [un]willing," he characteristically says, "by glossing over the shortcomings and the faults of the past, to weaken any plea for good understanding now and in the future."

The first of the five addresses is devoted to a presentation of the reasons for America's entrance into the war and why she did not come in sooner. The second and third are devoted to a very interesting and suggestive general survey of British-American relations.

For the next address, on the Monroe doctrine, Mr. McLaughlin acknowledges his indebtedness to Hart's *The Monroe doctrine: an interpretation.* Probably historians as well as other people will continue to disagree as to what the Monroe doctrine means. It certainly does not help to a correct understanding of it to quote as genuine the alleged "secret treaty" of the congress of Verona (1822), in which the continental allies are represented as banding together to put down everywhere in Europe representative government and the liberty of the press, on the ground that the former is "as incompatible with the monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right." Mr. McLaughlin is here doubtless misled by the currency given to the "treaty" by a certain senator. If he himself had investigated the evidence he would surely have been warned by the fact that Alison Phillips and other writers on the European concert know nothing of such a pact; that it is not to be found in Martens'

Recueil des traités; that Tétot, who does cite it in his *Répertoire*, does so merely to throw doubt on its genuineness; and that even Jonathan Elliott, whose *American diplomatic code* first gave currency to the document, knows nothing of it until his second edition in 1834.

The concluding address, on "The background of American federalism," is devoted chiefly to proving "that the essential qualities of American federal organization were largely the product of the practises of the old British empire as it existed before 1764."

The printer and proofreader evidently nodded at several places in this otherwise attractive book, for example, on pages 39, 40, 101, 150; but surely nothing short of inspiration can explain the expression (p. 71), "The American system of *providential* government!" A tragic explanation of the way these slips escaped the keen eye of the author is to be found in the simple dedication to the memory of his son, Captain Rowland H. McLaughlin, "who gave his life for the principles of justice and honor among nations at the Meuse, October 14th, 1918."

S. B. H.

The New America. By an Englishman, Frank Dilnot. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 145 p. $1.25)

This cleverly-written and rather gossipy little book is a sympathetic attempt to let Americans see themselves as others see them, as well as to give Englishmen better understanding of their "cousins across the sea." Most interesting are the author's impressions of the "Women of America," "American hustle and humor," and "Food, dress, drink and taxicabs." In the chapter "America at war" the characteristic spirit of the nation is brought out and the author comments on the soldiers, who display, he says, a "boyishness, fierceness and intensity totally unknown in the older nations." In the final chapter, "England through a telescope," an excellent summary of the present form of government of England is given and the unifying forces are pointed out which will bind together by closer ties the English and Americans of the coming generations.

History of Spain. Founded on the *Historia de España y de la civilización española* of Rafael Altamira. By Charles E. Chapman, Ph.D. assistant professor of history, University of California. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 559 p. $2.60 net)

For nearly a score of years Hispanic-American students have used Rafael Altamira's scholarly volumes as a background for their historical work. Many have wished for a translation that would make this material accessible to the growing list of persons whose interest in Spain and its former colonies has outstripped their familiarity with the Span-

ish language, but the prospective expense of publishing has proved prohibitive. In lieu of an English edition of the complete work a wide circle of readers will welcome Mr. Chapman's condensed narrative, frankly based on the Spanish original, but showing evidences of careful selection, sound scholarship, and of independent judgment in the supplemental chapters.

The volume is about one-fifth the size of the parent work. Mr. Chapman's method has been to select his material rather than to attempt wholesale condensation. Occasionally, as in the first chapter, he follows the original closely, but by omitting details that refer largely to Spain itself, he can emphasize those features that concern the later development of Hispanic America. His last two chapters continue the narrative beyond 1808, where Altamira stops. Chapman also contributes additional material dealing with the diplomacy of Charles III — material with which his readers of *The founding of Spanish California* are already familiar. The frontispiece is a general map of Spain, compiled by the author, showing physical features and chief cities; there is also reproduced from Shepherd's *Atlas* a series showing the political development of Spain during the middle ages. There is an excellent classified bibliography of material available for English readers, and a full, accurate index, which is also serviceable in locating the Spanish terms scattered through the text. Altogether Mr. Chapman has produced a scholarly book and one that is very readable, despite very obvious suggestions of the textbook.

A work that is so largely a selective compilation must show the defects as well as the good points of the original. Others have already indicated that Altamira's weak point is the Arabic domination in Spain. Chapman's purpose makes it unnecessary to stress this period. Frequently, however, the process of condensing causes too abrupt a transition in the narrative, and this at times becomes altogether too choppy when the author, like his model, attempts to consider conditions in all the minor subdivisions of the peninsula. To the reviewer it would seem better to omit such references altogether or to introduce them only for contrast or comparison with the development of Castile, Aragon, or Portugal, as the case may be. After all, Mr. Chapman plans his volume primarily as an introduction to Hispanic America, to whose history and institutions he proposes to devote another volume, so that minor areas might receive still less mention than he makes. This is not a serious fault and his book will serve admirably as a basis for readings in the miscellaneous list of monographs, general histories, special treatises, and books of travel that already crowd Spanish bibliographies.

The historical student needs a clear, concise picture of Spain's politi-

cal, social, and economic condition at the moment when modern colonial activity begins. He should supplement this by reviewing the development of typical institutions that Spain later transmitted to the new world. The author gives the material for such a picture and review, but apparently he prefers to leave the immediate creative task to the instructor. The latter may find this a sharp challenge to his pedagogic ability. The author's course may arise from too closely following Altamira by halting the political narrative in order to review the social and economic progress of a given era. Evidently that was necessary in a detailed national history for Spanish readers. An alternative course would have been to present a summary of Spain's political development to the beginning of the sixteenth century and to follow this with a careful study of those institutions or phases of Iberian life that Spain contributed to the new world. Then the reader would be ready for the brief, picturesque summary which we still lack.

The above criticism involves a question of judgment, wherein men may easily differ. The discriminating scholar will welcome the author's opinion regarding the respective merits of Arabic and Moorish contributions racial or cultural, his discussion of the fiasco of the great Armada, and his just appreciation of the part played by the Spaniards themselves in the peninsular war. The scholar will also approve the author's thesis that the colonies of Spain were as much affected by her institutional development from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century as during the preceding period, although his text alone does not always establish a close connection between the experiences of the mother country and happenings in the colonies. Perhaps the author plans to complete the nexus in the supplemental volume that he has promised us. Generally sympathetic with things Spanish, Mr. Chapman can be exceedingly critical, as in the two brief chapters in which he supplements the narrative of the Spaniard. Certainly one will have little quarrel with the author's apportionment of space. The period before the Catholic sovereigns is covered by two-fifths of the volume, while the rest of the space is about equally divided by the year 1700. The first six chapters treat of the life of the people and their political development in about equal measure, while thereafter the relative proportions are about two to one, respectively. In this readjustment of historical topics the Spanish historian was the pioneer but his American interpreter shows himself an able, painstaking, and thoroughly judicious follower.

Isaac J. Cox

Rise of the Spanish-American republics. As told in the lives of their liberators. By William S. Robertson, Ph.D., assistant professor of history, University of Illinois. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1918. 380 p. $3.00 net)

The wars of liberation in Spanish-America, judging from the literary output, have exerted a fascination similar to our own American revolution. For one thing they afford a less dangerous theme than most topics of recent origin, but not even as an exhibit of "safety first" for historian can we account for the prodigious stock of source collections, biographies and memoirs, general histories, and monographs to which these struggles have given rise. In this combined output appear the publications of more than a dozen separate countries, largely devoted to the championing of national claims and national heroes or dealing with wider regional controversies evolved by commanding personalities. Nor were the literary possibilities of the contest lost upon contemporary writers of that period or of succeeding generations. Many of the revolutionary actors had literary talents of no mean quality, or were blest with intimate friends so gifted. Outsiders drawn into the struggle hastened into print to explain its meaning to their fellow countrymen, or to justify their presence and actions therein, or to describe their strange companions-in-arms and the superb natural setting of their widespread campaigns. From these and other causes there has resulted a tangled mass of material, frequently conceived on broad lines of sound scholarship, often tantalizingly incomplete and faulty, but offering to the patient investigator of today a large and little-worked historical opportunity of the first magnitude.

In the present volume Mr. Robertson essays the task of interpreting for English readers a portion of this printed material and he also calls their attention to some of the manuscript sources with which he is familiar. In his preface he notes the chief problems that confronted him. It was no easy task to collect his material from a score of widely separated archives and libraries. The choice of a method for presenting his results — chronological, regional, or more strictly national — involved difficulties. His final selection of the biographical form was a compromise that is not wholly satisfactory. His bibliography represents a careful selection from the manuscripts and printed sources used and in a measure supplies the lack of footnotes, for which omission he makes no apology. His pages everywhere show evidence of such extreme care in collecting and collating his information and in revising judgments that special students will greatly regret the absence of footnotes. The index is accurate but too condensed to be thoroughly satisfactory. A dozen portraits, two small maps, and a battle plan comprise the illustrations.

Criticism must concern itself with problems of selection rather than with performance. One might expect the mention of Burr's conspiracy as a portent of outside interest later expressing itself in filibustering enterprises, or look for some reference to the stimulating effect exerted by the defense of Buenos Aires upon the creole population of the vicinity. Occasionally the reader would welcome a more dramatic treatment of such events as the early campaigns of Hidalgo or the famous interview between Bolivar and San Martin. Two of the early chapters relate to Hidalgo and to Iturbide. The author believes, and rightly, that the Mexicans overestimate the services of the former. Some of his readers will question whether he himself does not err in a similar manner in regard to Iturbide. More will object to his crowding the story of the ten intervening years within the compass of five pages. In view of the biographical method this disproportion in treatment is perhaps inevitable. Certainly the forerunner and the finisher of the revolutionary movement in Mexico stand out more clearly because of this treatment.

From Mexico Mr. Robertson takes his readers to the lower provinces of South America. Moreno, who gives title to one chapter, is not a familiar figure, possibly because he is not a military leader. Before treating of San Martin, who heads the following chapter, the author hurriedly introduces Artigas, La Vallija, and Francia, and through these tries to account for the later emergence of Uruguay and Paraguay. Brazil comes in for casual mention only and Chile lacks the connected treatment necessary to present her history in proper perspective. When, in the next two chapters, the scene shifts to northern South America, the author skillfully avoids many chances for repetition in describing the careers of Bolivar and of Tucré, or for retelling what he has already described in connection with Miranda and San Martin. In avoiding this repetition he occasionally loses unity within the chapter. Here again such characters as Paez and Santander appear only in casual references.

These points serve only to make clear the difficulty of describing such an extended conflict embracing so diverse a population and also to explain the tendency towards separation that almost immediately resulted in the formation of eleven distinct nationalities, not counting Brazil, the minor states of Central America, and the West Indies. The introductory and concluding chapters mention these factors without extended description. From Mr. Robertson's previous work one might have expected a more complete account of the diplomacy that assisted in gaining recognition of political independence, but the interested reader must find the pathway to further research through the bibliography. Typo-

graphical slips are few (pp. 205 and 229). An occasional paragraph (p. 189) might be relegated to footnotes were they used. Something more expressive than doubt might be used to characterize the relations of the intendants with other local subordinates (p. 8) or to surmise about the humanity of colonial officials generally (p. 10). But these are minor discrepancies and should not lessen hearty appreciation of the many excellent features of the book. Through its scholarly pages American readers encounter in a new setting revolutionary principles that remind us of our own contest for political independence, albeit this contest manifests itself in leaders of unfamiliar type. That the deeds of a score of them may become more familiar is the aim of Mr. Robertson, and in this he has achieved marked success.

I. J. C.

Idealism and the modern age. By George Plimpton Adams, Ph.D., associate professor of philosophy, University of California. (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 253 p. $2.50)

The curious historian must often ask himself in what light his work and achievements are regarded by scholars in other fields. To such a person *Idealism and the modern age* by George Plimpton Adams will be interesting because in it he will find the philosopher's estimate and evaluation of some of the dominant forces in history. A few quotations taken at random will prove illuminating. "To enter fully into the life of any historical community is to apprehend the past . . . this interest in the life of the past and in the study of history is significant . . . it is certainly different from a utilitarian interest in the past, a desire to use the experiences of the past in the solution of present difficulties. . ." Here then is the "aesthetic" side of history which many an ardent apostle of the "new history" may well ponder on.

Stressing further the difference between history and kindred sciences, Mr. Adams says: "History seeks to envisage with insight and sympathy the individual. Its interest terminates in the individual, the other sciences are interested in individuals only as instances of types and laws. . . To insist, then, that the objects of our historical interest are really individuals and not universal laws or types is at the same time to emphasize the non-behavior and non-pragmatic character of the mind's interest in other minds, in the past, and in the historical life of communities." Even among the historians, Mr. Adams sees a division into two camps. "There is," he says, "a very familiar issue about the way in which historical events and achievements had best be interpreted, and the part taken by individuals in historical processes. There are historians who care nothing for institutions and there are those who

care not at all about individuals. There are those who believe that every significant historical change must have been somewhere initiated by an individual, and there are those who view the individual merely as one who seizes upon and utters forces which he finds already in existence and which he does not at all create."

The author is working with plastic material, seeking to apprehend the invisible currents which dominate and pervade the social structure. Religion, education, ethics, aesthetics, morality, all are laid beneath the microscope in an attempt to analyze and classify. And even as he writes, changes take place and the cataclysm of social currents sweeps on.

The Atlantic monthly and its makers. By M. A. DeWolfe Howe. (Boston: Atlantic monthly press, 1919. 106 p. $1.00)

That Holmes named it; that Lowell called it his "old man of the sea" and was its first editor; that "The battle hymn of the republic," the "Commemoration ode," "A man without a country," first saw light in its pages — these facts and many others connected with the history of the *Atlantic monthly* few people know. From the days when the *Atlantic* was a family until today when it is a corporation, many names held dear to America's readers have been closely associated with its growth and progress. James Russell Lowell, James T. Fields, William Dean Howells, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, the editors of the magazine; Oliver Wendell Holmes, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Ralph Waldo Emerson, its contributors — it is bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh. Merging the goodly heritage of our grandfathers in the intellectual current of today, absorbing the New England tradition in the life of all America, broadening and widening its horizon until it touches the lives of thousands — thus have grown the *Atlantic monthly.*

With rare judgment and skill, easily as if he were recording the story of dear friends and intimates, M. A. DeWolfe Howe describes the *Atlantic monthly and its makers.* It makes delightful reading, the quotations are well selected, the woodcuts highly artistic. One closes the book with but one criticism — Mr. Howe has stopped too soon.

A. L.

Historic shrines of America. Being the story of one hundred and twenty historic buildings and the pioneers who made them notable. By John T. Faris. (New York: George H. Doran company, [1918]. 421 p. illustrated. $3.00 net)

This book is frankly intended for popular consumption. As the foreword indicates, it is the author's design to stimulate patriotism by encouraging vacation tours to sites of historic interest in America, and it

appears to be his fond conviction that the buildings he has selected are comparable in interest and importance with those tourists have been wont to visit in the "tight little island over the sea." These one hundred and twenty buildings are located in various states from Maine to Texas. Concerning each there are miscellaneous bits of information culled from the secondary sources listed in the bibliography and to each is assigned its share of anecdote relating to the love affairs or the domestic traits of the hero who dwelt therein. So far as the book may be said to have an historical point of view, it is that of a generation to whom all revolutionary patriots were heroes and all loyalists, traitors. All the familiar figures from Paul Revere to Davy Crockett reappear in their traditional guise. The perpetuation of a legendary point of view in a book of this kind is all the more to be deplored because it will no doubt fall into the hands of many who are otherwise uninformed and because, moreover, the author's patriotic motive is thoroughly sincere and much of his information is substantially correct.

MARTHA L. EDWARDS

Treaties of 1785, 1799 and 1828 between the United States and Prussia. As interpreted in opinions of attorneys-general, decisions of courts, and diplomatic correspondence. Edited by James Brown Scott, director division of international law, Carnegie endowment for international peace. (New York: Oxford university press, 1918. 208 p.)

In March, 1917, after relations between the United States and Germany had been broken off, the division of international law of the Carnegie endowment for international peace published a pamphlet containing the texts of the three treaties which, in the main, had regulated the relations of the two nations, together with the opinions of the attorneys-general of the United States, the decisions of the federal courts, and the correspondence between the two governments relating to the nature and binding effects of the instruments. At the early outbreak of war, the treaties were entirely abrogated or suspended, except two articles of the agreement of 1799. They, however, have not lost their interest or importance for either the student of diplomatic history or the specialist in international law; and the Carnegie endowment has done well to reissue the earlier pamphlet in revised and permanent form. The treaty texts are printed in both English and French, in parallel columns, and fill somewhat more than one-fourth of the new volume. Half of the space is taken up by opinions of attorneys-general and reports of court decisions on controverted aspects of the conventions during the

second half of the nineteenth century. The remaining quarter is devoted to diplomatic correspondence in 1915-1916 relating to the cases of the *William P. Frye* and the *Appam*. A few minor errors in the earlier editions have been corrected, and the present volume is everything that a source book of international relations should be.

FREDERIC A. OGG

The armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800. A collection of official documents preceded by the views of representative publicists. Edited by James Brown Scott, director division of international law, Carnegie endowment for international peace. (New York: Oxford university press, 1918. 698 p.)

The statement of President Wilson in his address before congress on February 26, 1917, that in view of the failure of ordinary diplomatic means to protect neutral rights it might be necessary to resort to armed neutrality, roused throughout the country a strong desire to know what armed neutrality meant, and especially to know what were the precedents for it which the president had declared to be abundant. To meet this demand, the division of international law of the Carnegie endowment for international peace promptly issued two pamphlets dealing with the armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800; also a volume on the controversy over neutral rights between the United States and France in 1797-1800, in which the American precedents in the matter were established. The materials presented in the two pamphlets, revised and considerably amplified, are now brought together in a substantial volume under the title indicated above. The principal addition is a collection of extracts, aggregating 270 pages, drawn from those portions of American and foreign works on international law that relate to the two neutralities. Thirty different authorities are quoted, ranging from Bluntschli and Geffcken to Wheaton and Woolsey. The original documents, consisting mainly of correspondence, memoranda, proclamations, and conventions, are presented uniformly in English; and for the purpose fresh translations have in many cases been made. An appendix, however, contains several of the principal papers in the original French. There is a full bibliography; and explanatory matter, without expression of personal opinion, is provided generously. Altogether the volume presents an unexceptionable piece of editing.

F. A. O.

The government of the United States. National, state and local. By William Bennett Munro, Ph.D., LL.B., professor of municipal government in Harvard university. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 648 pp. $2.75)

Teachers of political science welcome a new text in American government as enthusiastically as dramatic critics welcome a new play, for in both cases there is the persistent hope that the great American masterpiece will be the next to appear. Both may be doomed to eternal disappointment. Yet the quest for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow has never proved altogether profitless; the effort itself almost certainly results in gain. In this instance Mr. Munro has produced a text that in many respects is a decided improvement upon its predecessors. It is perhaps the most readable exposition of our system of government since Bryce's memorable volumes; in the judgment of the reviewer, too, it is the best planned of all our texts on American government from the standpoint of teaching. The separate treatment of structure and functions, the arrangement of material in shorter and more homogeneous chapters, the use of guide notes in the margins, are some of the more obvious merits by way of organization. The writer preserves, on the whole, a nice balance in the distribution of space. Particularly commendable is his exposition of the much neglected judicial system at greater length than usual. Further, he gives a more extended treatment of individual rights and immunities than it has been the custom to include in general texts. It is still too meager, however; if American government is to be taught primarily to make better citizens, is it not of prime importance that we emphasize the individual, his privileges and duties, his legal and political position in the state, his practical relationships with his government?

The general scheme of the treatment pursued throughout the book is well described by the author himself in the preface: "I have endeavored, so far as the limits of a single volume would permit, not only to explain the form and functions of the American political system, but to indicate the origin and purpose of the various institutions, to show how they have been developed by law or by usage, to discuss their present-day workings, merits and defects, and to contrast the political institutions of the United States with analogous institutions in other lands." This is an ideal design, but extremely difficult of accomplishment. Clearly it is desirable to have enough institutional history so that the institution as it exists today may be thoroughly understood. But for political science the line should be drawn here; for example, the need of six pages of banking history is not quite apparent.

It is a testimonial to the teaching experience of Mr. Munro that he

reiterates the fundamental facts of the federal system of government at every favorable opportunity, and shows how the political genius of the American people has employed that system with marked success in spite of its inherent weaknesses. Chapter 14 contains a particularly lucid exposition of the division of powers between the states and the federal government. The federal concept is rather static in his hands, however, and it might have been well to point out how a federal "state" tends to become a unitary state in fact, leaving what we call a federal form of government as historical evidence of its origin. Furthermore, it is to be regretted that the problem of sovereignty is not dealt with more clearly. The states, the author declares, are the original source of governmental powers in the United States. Their powers are inherent powers possessed *ab initio* and not received by grant "from the federal constitution or from any other overhead source" (p. 389). But they have irrevocably granted "upwards" to the federal government extensive powers and have become "forever subject to the limitations which the constitution places upon themselves" (p. 391). Thus, in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, "the powers of sovereignty are divided between the government of the Union and those of the States." And Mr. Munro seems to reject Calhoun's doctrine of indivisible sovereignty, declaring that Marshall's doctrine "is accepted by the weight of authority." Still, on the next page, he asserts that "sovereignty is by nature indivisible," and that in the United States "there is no partition of sovereignty" but only a division of governmental powers. The reader hardly knows whether Mr. Munro is a believer in dual sovereignty or not.

The author consistently maintains an attitude of well-reasoned conservatism. There is much valuable constructive criticism but no radical overturning of established institutions. Thus he warmly defends our constitution in spite of the alleged reactionary character of its philosophy: "It has at any rate afforded scope for the development of democratic institutions on a scale such as the constitutions and laws of no other country have ever permitted" (p. 70). He makes an able defense of it against Dicey's charge of rigidity, pointing out that it has in fact developed to meet the needs of the times, and that if we are to compare the constitutions of the United States and England, we must use the term "constitution" in the same sense. His strong conservatism appears, too, in his defense of the party system and the party caucus, and his reprobation of the independent voter. Federalism, he thinks, demand partyism.

In some instances statements are made which, if not erroneous, are at least misleading. Bryce originally suggested the application of the

terms "rigid" and "flexible" to constitutions, in a lecture of 1884 (p. 57). "Today the President of the United States is as directly chosen by the voters as though there were no intervening electors at all" (p. 64). This is putting it rather strongly when twelve of our presidents did not receive a majority of the popular vote, and two of these not even a plurality. On page 83, the impression is given that the due process protection is a privilege or immunity of a United States citizen as such, whereas in fact it is secured to all persons under amendments V and XIV. On pages 84-85, a distinction should be drawn between rights guaranteed against the states and those guaranteed against the federal government, making it clear that amendments I-VIII apply only to the latter government; it seems hardly necessary to postpone a correction that is so easily made to chapter 20. On page 90, "both" should be "one at least." Recess appointments continue till the end of the next session of the senate, not "until the Senate has had the opportunity to take action" (p. 106). This statement is revised on page 164. It was hardly Washington's "practice, in the earlier years of his administration, to attend in person whenever executive sessions of the Senate were held for the consideration of treaties" (p. 162). Only one instance is recorded (in 1789) and Washington is reported to have said "he would be damned if he ever went there again." It may be strictly accurate to say that "every form of international agreement to which the United States is a party must be submitted to the Senate in this way" (p. 166), but it would certainly be better to make some mention here of the executive agreements which play a not unimportant part in our foreign relations. On page 290 it is stated that "the punishment of treason against the United States, as fixed by statute, is death." The statute also provides an alternative penalty of fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court.

The sins of omission are few. Far the worst, from the teacher's standpoint, is the failure to include a text of the constitution. Nor is the author careful always to quote the constitutional clause that should be the starting point for the discussion. There should certainly be a more detailed index, from which works cited in footnotes might very well be omitted.

ALBERT R. ELLINGWOOD

History of the civil war, 1861-1865. By James Ford Rhodes, LL.D., D.Litt. (New York: Macmillan company, 1917. 454 p. $2.50 net)

In general plan and format this book resembles the volumes of Mr. Rhodes' larger work of seven volumes. "This is not an abridgement of my three volumes on the Civil War," he says in the preface, "but a fresh study of the subject in which I have used my work as one of

many authorities. Whenever I have transferred sentences, paragraphs and pages, I have done so because, after a study of the original authorities, I have found that I could give my conclusions no better than in my first work."

The new material in the volume is extracted from scores of biographical and autobiographical works such as Wilson's *Life of Rawlins*, Thayer's *Life of John Hay, Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, and the like. In addition to these there are many references to memoirs, letters, diaries, and descriptions by participants in the war or by prominent persons in the service of the two governments.

Such sources give a personal or biographical emphasis to Mr. Rhodes' work, which begins and ends with a sentence relating to Abraham Lincoln. The portraits of Davis, Grant, Meade, Johnston, and Stanton compel interest and impress the reader by the fairness of the author's judgment. Lincoln, impatient to discuss the news of the battle of Bull Run, repaired to the office of Winfield Scott and there found the aged and infirm general in his afternoon sleep. When the author declares that in the battle of Cold Harbor Grant attacked with "unjustifiable precipitation" and that the battle is "the greatest blemish on his reputation as a general" the criticism does not prevent him from giving other and more favorable judgments on Grant as a fighting man.

One misses in this book evidence of the extensive use of newspaper sources, which seem more abundant in the larger history. The author in writing keeps close to the tents of the generals and commanders, and his descriptions of marches are those of corps, and brigades, and divisions. One would gladly read more about the privates, the plain soldiers — how they were fed, what their amusements were, how they drilled and marched, and how they were clothed. "Private letters from soldiers to their homes in the Western States told of the useless slaughter [at Shiloh] and roused a feeling of indignation toward Grant." Such material, it would seem, would be as valuable as Halleck's despatches.

Mr. Rhodes marshals his facts compactly and the reader follows him from campaign to campaign and from battle to battle with unabated interest. The mechanical features of the book, such as the printing and binding, are well done. The arrangement of the volume into chapters and sections, the footnotes, bibliography, index, and the fifteen maps of battles and campaigns are welcome assets to the reader and to the more critical student.

Life of Lieutenant General Chaffee. By William Harding Carter. (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1917. 296 p.)

This is an accurate account, by one of his younger comrades, of the life and services of one of our most faithful and loyal military men.

With only four pages given to his early life on the Western Reserve (1842-1861), the story proceeds at once to Chaffee's enlistment at nineteen in the sixth cavalry regiment, and traces his services through the civil war in the army of the Potomac. The services of Chaffee and of his regiment are shown to have been excellent and he was promoted during the war to the rank of first lieutenant and was brevetted captain. The author joined Chaffee's regiment in 1874, so that he had first-hand knowledge of his subject. As the author says, it is regrettable that during the period of his most active service, the civil war, Chaffee did not keep a journal as he did later.

His career after the civil war is traced as follows: he was occupied some thirty years on the western frontier, then served in the Spanish war, conducted the relief expedition to Pekin, and suppressed the uprising in the Philippines. In 1902 he returned to America and in 1904 was promoted to the highest rank then in the army, lieutenant general, and was detailed as chief of staff. Finally in 1906 at his own request he was retired, after forty-four years of service, and the eight remaining years of his life were spent in California.

The inclusion of much documentary material in the form of letters adds to the interest and value of the work. The story of Chaffee's life is well told and the publishers have done their part well.

H. J. Webster

A lieutenant of cavalry in Lee's army. By G. W. Beale. (Boston: Gorham press, 1918. 231 p. $1.25 net)

Reverend G. W. Beale tells his own story in *A lieutenant of cavalry in Lee's army.* The narrative is interesting because published long after the events about which it is centered had transpired. It is written with no resentment, but is rather the calm reminiscence of an old man who looks back on that chapter of his life with no rancor or bitterness. The narrative is enriched in spots by the introduction of Lieutenant Beale's letters to his mother. Some of the chapters, such as "Experiences in a confederate hospital," "The closing weeks under the stars and bars," should prove useful as source material in studying the history of the period.

Hamilton Fish. By A. Elwood Corning. (New York: Lanmere publishing company, 1918. 108 p.)

This brief monograph supplies the reader with a good popular account of Grant's secretary of state. Based upon well-known accessible sources, it presents no new light upon the leading problems of Fish's administration. The main facts in connection with the treaty of Washington, however, Sumner's quarrel with Grant, the *Virginius* affair, and the

San Domingo episode are related in clear, forceful manner. In developing Fish's belief that diplomatic intercourse should be characterized "by honesty of purpose, clearness of perception, and fairness of method," the author has given the reader an excellent account of the settlement of the Alabama claims; and, in so doing, has shown how England and America can peaceably settle their most difficult disputes. The essay is, therefore, timely and useful in this period of growing Anglo-American sympathy.

R. C. McGrane

George Westinghouse. His life and achievements. By Francis E. Leupp. (Boston: Little, Brown and company, 1918. 305 p.)

An interesting narrative, clear print, good paper, adequate illustration, and a fairly detailed index, prepossess one in favor of Mr. Francis E. Leupp's life of George Westinghouse. Its limitations are incomplete source material, non-critical use of information, and a lack of interpretative skill in dealing with the subject and the forces he called into being.

Since Mr. Westinghouse left no files of personal correspondence or diaries, the author relied on the memories of friends, local traditions, gossip, records of courts and of public meetings, corporate reports and partnership account books, old volumes of newspapers and magazines, miscellaneous scrapbooks, and the like. Lack of footnotes makes it difficult to determine what is included under "books, volumes of old newspapers and magazines." In addition to the material which Mr. Leupp used, copies or originals of correspondence should have been obtainable from the large number of individuals with whom Mr. Westinghouse had relations and from the business files of various companies with which he was connected. Business papers other than those covered by the terms corporate reports and partnership account books exist and probably could have been examined. There is practically untouched Westinghouse material located in America and elsewhere in engineering society journals and other publications, engineering periodicals, trade publications, newspapers, world exposition reports, records of patent offices, congressional records, and reports of various departments of foreign governments. The amount of evidence concerning Mr. Westinghouse is so large, in fact, that an adequate treatment of his life would require not one but several volumes, one of which would be devoted to documents.

Little indication exists of the evaluation of materials. Traditions and recollections are cited when the exactly quoted words can be, at best, only an approximation of reality. These sources are given equal credence with authentic documents.

There is social and economic significance in the forces which the genius of men like Westinghouse let loose to play upon the society of their time and this. Westinghouse invented and developed the air brake, a factor of incalculable good. He became interested in natural gas in Pittsburgh, conceived machinery to control it and to develop it, secured a charter "so drawn that under it you can do almost anything you care to except engage in the business of banking," with the result that the company he is responsible for today "controls substantially all the public utilities in the city and immediate suburbs."

By a combination of invention and promotion, Mr. Westinghouse built up the Westinghouse electric company, eventually the chief rival of the General electric company. In itself, the development of these two great corporations and their long struggle over the respective merits of direct and indirect current forms one of the economic dramas of the era.

Mr. Leupp's book is a gifted amateur's achievement, the value of which consists in its indicating the possibilities and value of an adequate biography of Mr. Westinghouse.

HERBERT A. KELLAR

The fathers of New England. A chronicle of the Puritan commonwealths. By Charles M. Andrews. [The chronicles of America. Edited by Allen Johnson under the supervision of the committee on publications of the Yale university council] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 210 p. $3.50)

Volume six of the Chronicles of America series, like its predecessors, is a charming product of the printer's art. Artistically bound, with beautiful photogravures and an excellent bibliography and complete index, it is an addition to any book lover's library, and an aid both to the general reader and to the historical student.

Books almost without number have been written about New England's history, but seldom does one find an account with the broad historical view point of the one under discussion. The causes of the coming of the pilgrims are clearly and concisely stated, the classes of society from which the emigrants came are described, and a rather new idea is advanced. The author states: "The greatness of the Pilgrims lay in their illustrious example and in the influence they exercised upon the church life of the later New England colonies, for to the Pilgrims was due the fact that the congregational way of organization and worship became the accepted form in Massachusetts and Connecticut. But in other respects Plymouth was vastly overshadowed by her vigor-

ous neighbors. Her people, humble and simple, were without importance in the world of thought, literature, or education. . . No great movement can be traced to their initiation, no great leader to birth within their borders, and no great work of art, literature or scholarship to those who belonged to this unpretending company. The Pilgrim Fathers stand rather as an emblem of virtue than a moulding force in the life of the nation."

The settlement of the various New England colonies is discussed in detail. A chapter is devoted to early New England life in which the educational system, occupations, town meetings, religion, and travel of the colonies are discussed. A rather interesting idea is brought out that hardly a fifth of those in Massachusetts were professed Christians. This goes to prove the author's statement that religious convictions were by no means the only driving motive that sent hundreds of men to New England.

Further chapter headings, "The attempts at colonial union," "Winning the charters," "Massachusetts defiant," "War with the Indians," "The Bay colony disciplined," and "The Andros régime," will show the line of development followed by the author in his discussion.

ESTHER M. DOLE

Colonel John Scott of Long Island, 1634(?)-1696. By Wilbur C. Abbott, professor of history in Yale university. (New Haven: Yale university press, 1918. 94 p. $1.25)

Scott was a rascal — "of all failures in the conflict between man and oblivion . . . perhaps the worst." So Mr. Abbott presents him in a study prepared originally for the Society of colonial wars in the state of New York. Of uncertain origin, with native wit and audacity, Scott was a not inconsiderable figure in the seventeenth century but he had not the success to blot out his sins. Land speculator, he all but became governor of Long Island, a fourteenth American colony. Court-martialed in the West Indies, he stalked treasonably through England, the Netherlands, and France, hobnobbing with Stuarts and Cromwellians, stealing hats and avoiding board bills, now royal cartographer, now tool of Buckingham. The study's chief value is as a cross section of seventeenth century English and colonial history, "seen, as it were, from the under side." Scott's vindication came two centuries later when his *Discription of Guiana* helped settle the Venezuela boundary, and John Pollock and George Edmundson took him seriously. Mr. Abbott had not yet written.

IRVING S. KULL

Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. By Lewis A. Leonard. (New York: Moffat Yard and company, 1918. 313 p. $2.50 net)

The best chapters in this volume are those which deal with Carroll as a staunch supporter of Washington during the war of independence, as the adviser of Franklin in the matter of effecting an alliance with France, and as the dominating force in promoting the cause of the revolution in Maryland. The author cites opinions that but for Carroll Washington would have been removed from the post of commander-in-chief. He tells how Carroll, a Catholic and acquainted with Frenchmen of influence, was qualified to prepare Franklin for his mission to France, and adds: "Dr. Franklin did the work . . . on lines laid out by Carroll and supported by Washington." As the political leader of Maryland Carroll seems to have sided with the radicals in the first continental congress in support of the Massachusetts idea and subsequently he was chiefly instrumental in securing the passage by the Maryland convention of a resolution favoring a declaration of independence.

Few of the author's more important theses, however, are well supported by concrete facts and the value of the volume is further impaired by excessive eulogy and by comparisons in which one of the objects is well known and much liked while the other is little known but much disliked. The character of the author's knowledge and views of colonial Maryland may be seen from a few of his sentences: "It was the fascination of this government as well as its liberality that caused settlers from all directions to flock to the province" (p. 25). "He [the lord proprietor] . . . was the source of all power, and the maker of all laws. No one, not even the King had to be consulted in the management of the Province and its people" (p. 25). "He [the lord proprietor] was always diplomatic and frequently had his own way by seeming to let the Council and Assembly have theirs" (p. 35). "Just as you trace the Puritan strain in New England, the Huguenot in New York, the Quaker element in Pennsylvania, the Cavalier tone in Virginia and the Carolinas, so you find the ideals and traditions of the Irish predominating in old Maryland. And these traditions were of the most lofty that human nature, as then developed, was capable of enjoying" (p. 30).

Newton D. Mereness

Pictures of Illinois one hundred years ago. Edited by Milo Milton Quaife, superintendent of the State historical society of Wisconsin. (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley and sons company, 1918. 186 p.)

The centennial year offered a fitting occasion for the Lakeside press in its annual volume to offer this group of accounts descriptive of Illinois when it came into statehood. For the purpose the editor, Mr.

Quaife, has selected three of the most picturesque and entertaining sketches available, and has given them appropriate setting in his excellent historical introduction.

The first sketch is an extract from the *Notes on a journey from the coast of Virginia to the territory of Illinois* written by Morris Birkbeck, one of the founders of the famous English settlement at Albion; it gives the impressions of this enterprising and intelligent English farmer on his first visit to Illinois in 1817. The wide popularity Birkbeck's book enjoyed in its day is easy to understand even from this fragment, for it has a lure beyond and above its historical interest. As for its value as an historical document, its explicit record makes perhaps as close an approach to repetition of actual experience as is ever possible.

Following Birkbeck's picture of the prairies and woods comes a sketch from the pen of another Englishman, William Newnham Blane. Blane's visit to Illinois was only part of a longer journey, the story of which was published as *An excursion through the United States and Canada, during the years 1822-1823.* The principal event of his sojourn in Illinois was his visit to the English settlement, and his account furnishes an illuminating complement to the Birkbeck narrative by showing the progress made during five years. Inasmuch as the English settlement was after all unique, however, the fact that Blane's description of it was written after the lapse of several years weakens its value as a "picture of Illinois in 1818"; in a number of other instances, too, the author makes observations that he would scarcely have made in the earlier year. The description of traveling conditions and a wealth of interesting details, however, are accurate enough for the Illinois of 1818.

For the final sketch the editor has levied upon Henry Schoolcraft's *Travels in the central portions of the Mississippi valley*; the portion printed recounts the journey of the author from the mouth of the Illinois river to Chicago, whither he went to attend the negotiations with the Indians which resulted in the treaty of 1821. It pictures the valley of the Illinois "in the closing years of its wilderness existence," and recounts a typical example of the white men's dealings with the red men, whose doom was already sealed when Illinois became a state. The conditions pictured are essentially as true for 1818 as for 1821, the year which is actually dealt with.

To say that the volume is the product of the Donnelley press is testimony enough that its craftsmanship is of a high order. The publishers may indeed consider it proof of the stability and permanent value of their school of apprentices, which is responsible for the Lakeside classics, that even under the strain and abnormalities of war time this volume has come forth a creditable addition to the series.

Leila W. Tilton

Elementary American history and government. By James Albert Woodburn, Ph.D., professor of American history and politics in Indiana university, and Thomas Francis Moran, Ph.D., professor of history and economics in Purdue university. (New York: Longmans, Green, and company. 527 p. $1.00)

This is one of the recent popular textbooks in American history for the seventh and eighth grades. It was originally published in 1910 and has been frequently reissued, the latest edition coming out in 1918. It is an effort to solve the problem of selecting the proper topics in American history to be studied in these grades and of developing these topics adequately so that the significance of our national history will be readily comprehended by elementary school pupils. The authors have chosen to stress the governmental phases of our history and have therefore given special attention to the origin and development of our institutions of government, especially the central institutions. In fact it seems as if they have attempted to construct a book that would be a combination of a text in American history and of the essentials in civics. They have also given the social and industrial phases of our history considerable attention. The greater part of the book is devoted to the period since the close of the American revolution. The value of the book would have been considerably enhanced if the section on the period since the close of reconstruction had been developed at a little greater length. The maps are particularly good and the illustrations are well chosen. The explanatory notes accompanying the maps and illustrations add very materially to an understanding of the subjects with which they are connected. The book is worthy of the extensive use that has been made of it throughout the country.

E. M. Violette

The economic foundations of peace; or world-partnership as the truer basis of the league of nations. By J. L. Garvin. (London: Macmillan company, 1919. 574 pp. $3.25)

It is not necessary for one to accept unreservedly the "economic interpretation of history" before he can believe that economic questions underlie the very foundations of war and peace. It seemed hardly possible to doubt this until it was found that the peace conference had treated these questions so gingerly in the covenant of the league of nations.

Mr. Garvin believes that the great war was primarily one of food and raw materials. There was a time when nations were almost self-sufficing units, but science and invention had destroyed their separateness in finance, agriculture, and industry and made them interdependent. But political action had lagged behind and the new order was utterly lack-

ing in protection. Then "Vesuvius broke out amongst the gardens." It was a last despairing effort of Germany to free herself from this interdependence by assuming the mastery. The economic armageddon followed, a war of "all against all." Slowly, starting with the *Commission internationale ravitaillement*, the allies learned the value of fighting and working together. Still victory did not come until they were driven to unity of military command and virtual unity of economic action. If the lessons learned in war are not carried over into the organization for peace, says Mr. Garvin, the greater fruits of the war will be lost.

The author is sure that "Private trade is incapable of solving these problems. . . The abandonment of right international action under pressure of a demand for the removal of some limited commercial restraints might mean the ruin of the world's hopes for at least another generation, and violent class-conflicts in every country. National policy, both in Britain and America, must be as profoundly influenced by international necessities in this first stern and hazardous phase of peace as it was by international necessities during the war."

If the matter is turned over completely to private enterprise, the result will be either a great industrial autocracy of world-wide scope or another world war arising from the conflicts of competing national autocracies. If the United States should respond to a strong demand for breaking away from all economic partnership between the two sides of the Atlantic, "it is certain that the international operation of American trusts, rings, and combines would be pushed to the utmost on private account. This would be an anticlimax of American intervention. It would not be in the highest American spirit. It would be a half thing, like saving your comrade from being murdered, and then leaving him weltering in his wounds." Sinister forces are ready for the prey. Among them the author names the meat trust, which has a practical monopoly in the United States, has gathered in fifty per cent of the meat output in Argentina, and is laying plans for grasping England. In England are the shipping trust and the condensed milk trust. " 'Such giants'," quoting M. Gide, " 'may put the whole of the springs of government out of order, particularly in democratic societies.' "

The concrete problems that will have to be handled are food suplies, rationing of raw materials, shipping, indemnities and war debts, and labor unrest. For the necessary machinery Mr. Garvin would create a supreme economic board with subordinate councils of food, finance, raw materials, and shipping, and expert program committees for all main commodities. A labor commission is taken as a matter of course.

The proceedings of these bodies are to be "a commercial form of

diplomacy.'' Their power, however, extends only to gathering information and making recommendations (presumably to the individual nations), for the author says that he is ''not so insane as to suggest control of international trade and shipping by the Supreme Economic Council.'' The coöperation necessary for peace depends on ''voluntary adjustments'' following the receipt of expert information. Weak as this is, it may well be considered an improvement over the league, which provides a council with power merely to hear complaints or take up disputes about to lead to war, but none to look into and warn about conditions likely to cause disputes. Mr. Garvin's council would have the power to do this and, failing in this, to recommend the economic boycott, on which, he says, all depends.

The reviewer has not read all the books on peace and organization for peace, but, of those read, this is far and away the best on the causes of war. It is a matter of regret that it was not published before the peace conference met. If it only contained more concrete examples of the economic causes of war, the best service any wealthy friend of peace could render the cause would be to provide all members of congress, especially the senators, with copies and get them to take a vacation to study Mr. Garvin's argument.

DAVID Y. THOMAS

International war, its causes and its cure. By Oscar T. Crosby, LL.D., F.R.G.S. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 378 p. $5.00)

This book was written before the United States entered the war, but not published until 1919. The delay has caused no changes except to put the cure for war first, the causes last, and the addition of a few footnotes where Russia and Germany are referred to as under the old régime. It is not clear that anything has been gained by the transposition, while something of logical order has been lost. When people are asked to abolish an institution naturally they first want to know why, then how.

About half the book is devoted to the question of how war is to be cured. This part is divided into twenty-two chapters dealing with such topics as honor, limitations of armaments, cooling-off treaties, non-justiciable questions, status quo, public opinion, the proposition of the league to enforce peace, and the Fabian society plan, closing with eight chapters giving the author's plan and how to put it into operation. The last part as now arranged deals mainly with the alleged advantages of war, disadvantages, obsolete causes, and active causes, such as trade and industrial rivalries (tariffs, coal and iron, merchant marine), immigration and rights of citizenship, intervention (as in Cuba or in Serbia), finding foreign trouble to avert domestic trouble, love of power,

and avenging an insult. There is an appendix in eight divisions dealing with topics already discussed. Most of this could very well have been included in the body of the text. There is no index.

The author has made a careful study of the subject, has brought out many things of interest, and offers several valuable suggestions. But most Americans on reading that many here consented to the Spanish war only in the hope of healing the wounds caused by secession will demand further proof. People who have read the history of the past five years, or of the two years preceding the writing of this book, will be astonished to learn that we no longer have wars of "brutal conquest." The chapter dealing with non-justiciable subjects barely scratches the surface. The author here falls into the common error, that a national policy is in some way dissociated from any matter of right and therefore not justiciable under law and equity. He is wise enough, however, to remark that setting up a court to make distinctions between justiciable and non-justiciable disputes, without positive central control, will only increase irritation.

The most valuable part of the book is found in the seven chapters discussing the organization of the world for peace. These chapters, dealing with the question of an international executive, legislative, judiciary, and army, deserve a more extended notice than the limits of this review will allow.

D. Y. T.

American labor and the war. By Samuel Gompers, president of the American federation of labor. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1919. 377 p. $1.75 net)

It is a little difficult to fix the primary credit or responsibility for the publication of this volume. It consists of speeches delivered by Mr. Gompers and of papers which he undoubtedly had a hand in drawing up, and of two "Forewords" which he did not write. The addresses, covering 270 out of 377 pages, extend from one delivered on Labor day at Plattsburg, September 7, 1914, to one delivered at Chicago, November 8, 1918, in response to a reception tendered Mr. Gompers on his return from Europe. These addresses give a good idea of the fine spirit which animated in war time this long-time leader of the American laboring people in the days of peace. Mr. Gompers is a good speech-maker and his addresses, filled with a lofty patriotism, were well worth hearing when delivered, but few people will be interested in reading them now.

Part II consists mainly of reports from the executive council to the American federation of labor and of various papers and letters relating to attempts to hold an international labor conference. There is no index.

From the title one might expect some account of the difficulties produced by the labor situation and of the means used to meet them, or of the sacrifices and achievements of labor, if not its profiteering, but of these things we are told nothing. The difficulties in the coal mines, on the Pacific coast, and in various other places are not even mentioned. Any one who undertakes to write the history of labor for this period will find this book of very little help.

D. Y. T.

The war and education, addresses. By Andrew F. West, dean of the graduate school, Princeton university. (Princeton: Princeton university press, 1919. 87 p. $1.50 net)

What the war teaches about education and other papers and addresses. By Ernest Carroll Moore. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 334 p. $1.20)

Running through all Mr. West's addresses is a plea for the study of the so-called "humanities" and "classics," and an especial emphasis is demanded on the disciplinary studies and those that train the memory. In a forceful way Mr. West points out that among the lessons the war should teach are those of obedience and discipline. These are the lessons, too, which should be learned in the schoolroom. Our educational system, he says, is divided into two groups, education for knowledge and education for action. Although it is true that nine-tenths of our boys and girls must earn their living, yet they should have as much good general education as they have a chance to obtain. "Our general education," he says, however, "must be rigorously simplified and centered in the few studies which experience shows are of the most fundamental value for the development of an all round intelligence."

Utterly opposed to the idea of the "formal discipline" value of particular subjects in the school curriculum is Mr. Ernest Carroll Moore. He says, "all literature, all art, all science, all government, all religion is for education," "they have no other reason for existence than to teach folks to live well." As to the selection of the matter which children should be taught, he affirms that the principle or ideal of utility is the only guide which should be followed.

We are on the eve of a great educational revival. An education must be provided which is not materialistic but which will have "for its prime purpose the culture of human ideals." Therefore he insists that literature, mathematics, and science exist for man's sake and for no other reason. "Knowledge for the sake of knowledge, which is an empty claim, must be given up," says the author, and again he asserts quite emphatically, "The doctrine of formal discipline must go the way of

outworn superstitions." He devotes a whole chapter to "The doctrine of general discipline," and refutes all arguments of men who believe that the perusal of any one subject trains the mind so that it may more clearly grasp another subject. In discussions of mathematics, literature, and history the author tries to prove that only as they relate to the present are they of any value to the pupil.

Most interesting to the historian is his discussion "what is history and why do we want it?" If history cannot predict it can be of little use. "It is continuity of purpose which makes history vital." He would have historians dwell less on the discussion of the facts or events themselves and more on the application of those facts to the present as a preparation for the future. The study should be what might be called "the trial balance conception of history" rather than "the day book method."

The war has disclosed many faults of our educational system. The physical education of the youth has been neglected, our knowledge of agriculture is inadequate, the songs of the land are not well known, our knowledge of the history and the geography of the world has been found to be grossly inadequate and one of the most important lessons is that children cannot safely discontinue their studies at the age of fourteen years.

E. M. D.

The war diary of a diplomat. By Lee Meriwether. (New York: Dodd, Mead and company, 1919. 303 p. $2.00)

Among the most interesting of recent war books will be found this little volume written by the "Special assistant to the American ambassador to France." Mr. Meriwether speaks with authority, and his accounts of what he has seen and investigated in France, prior to and immediately following our entry into the war, are written with accuracy and in a pleasing style.

Mr. Meriwether's work as an investigator of the conditions of German war prisoners wakens special interest. Apparently he was admirably fitted for such investigation and the entrance of the United States into the war obviously lost to the German prisoners a sympathetic and justice-seeking friend.

Paris during war time was a subject to stimulate every observer into expression of what he saw and felt, and Mr. Meriwether offers many interesting pages from his experience. The indomitable spirit of the French, as ever, stirs the beholder into enthusiasm; while the dark shadow of threatening German *Kultur* brings a sigh of relief that the danger has now been averted.

Above the battle. By Romain Rolland. Translated by C. K. Ogden, M.A. Second edition. (Chicago: Open Court publishing company, 1916. 102 p. $1.00 net)

In this small book the author has collected a number of articles and open letters published by him during the early part of the war, together with appeals for peace emanating from the "intellectuals" of Spain and Holland. The purpose of the book is to plead with the educated classes of all the warring nations to be mindful of their common heritage. The peoples engaged in the conflict have no real cause for quarrel, according to the contention of the author, but were led into the struggle through the dark designs of their governments. It is with the governments that the guilt resides. "The worst enemy of each nation is not without, but within its frontiers, and none has the courage to fight against it. It is the monster of a hundred heads, the monster named Imperialism." It would be futile, as the author sadly realizes, to try to put an end to a struggle once started. What he does consider worth trying, however, is the organization of public opinion for the repudiation of wrongdoing, more particularly the crimes committed by the German government, so as to prepare the way for a lasting peace, a peace embodying the principle of self-determination.

B. H. Bode

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Children often play a game which consists of propounding the question "What would you do if—" coupled with some absurd supposition. Joseph Edgar Chamberlin, in his *Ifs of history,* substituting for the personal pronoun names from history, attempts in all seriousness to answer such questions. The author juggles with facts of history much as would a musician syncopating Bach's sonatas. Thus of the Armada's fate he says: "Santa Cruz, its chief, sickened in port and died. Very likely if he had sailed no such fate would have overtaken him." Very likely not.

This pastime of playing with possibilities is no new one. More than a generation ago, Gail Hamilton (Mary A. Dodge) in *A battle of the books* wrote: "There are never wanting persons who, not content with writing history as it is, are always conjuring up what would have been if things had happened differently. If Charles I had not lost his head, if Napoleon had beaten at Waterloo, if Booth's pistol had missed fire events would have gone thus and thus." And she conjures up the picture of Homer "cobbling shoes at Haverhill, or at most chronicling small beer in a country newspaper," of Dante "a lawyer in chambers, drawing up wills . . . but leaving no foot-prints on the sands of time," and of Bocaaccio "milking cows at Brook Farm, or growing round-shouldered over his desk in Jerusalem Court House."

To Mr. Chamberlin's credit it must be said, however, that in his interpretation of history, he shows rare insight and a close acquaintance with obscure facts. (Philadelphia: Henry Altemus company, 1919. 203 p. $1.00.)

The glamor of war holds many children spellbound, The hero of wars is the man with whose name they may conjure up deeds of bravery and valor,—and hair-breadth escapes. Few boys have not worshiped at the shrine of Washington and Jackson, Grant and Logan. *The story of General Pershing,* by Everett T. Tomlinson, will appeal to boys for no other reason than because it is the story of "Black Jack" (D. Appleton and company, 1919. 260 p. $1.50). As biographies go, it is flimsy. The author speaks in awed whispers, never forgetting the magnitude of his subject. But it is the story of a virile fighter, and what boy will miss reading it?

Captain Barry Cerf of the University of Wisconsin is the author of *Alsace-Lorraine since 1870,* an intensive study of this long-mooted question (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 190 p. $1.50). It is an appeal to the American jury to award the disputed territory to its rightful owner. All the standard secondary works have been consulted, and some source material has been introduced. "The economic question," a chapter based on recent statistics, is an important contribution to the economic interpretion of the Alsace-Lorraine issue.

The question of Alsace and Lorraine, by Thomas Willing Balch, is a more informal essay on the same subject (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane and Scott, 1918. 89 p.). It is based chiefly on personal impressions gained in traveling through those provinces, in the years 1890-1897. A somewhat limited number of authorities are cited in substantiation of the author's conclusions.

Four handbooks that will prove very useful to students of history, especially to students of English history, have recently made their appearance. The editors of the series "have asked acknowledged experts in various branches of history to put down in writing the kind of information which they would give to an inquiring student in half an hour's talk." The result is most gratifying. Much information, not otherwise readily accessible, is presented to the reader in an informal manner. E. C. Fowler is the author of *Episcopal registers of England and Wales,* Charles Johnson of the *Public Record office,* F. J. C. Hearnshaw of *Municipal records,* and Reginald L. Poole of "Medieval reckonings of time." (Macmillan company. $.20 each).

Women in American history, by Grace Humphrey (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill company, 1919. 223 p. $1.25), is devoted to narrative sketches of fifteen American women, chosen, it must be said, at random. It is written in an informal manner and should prove easy and interesting reading for children.

Two biographies for children have recently been added to the ever growing collection of children's histories. Mary L. Williamson is the author of the *Life of Robert E. Lee* and the *Life of Jackson*; both are intended as readers in the third and fourth grades. (Richmond: B. F. Johnson publishing company, 1918. $.50).

Le bulletin des recherches historiques for April, 1919, contains, among other articles, "Notes historiques sur le nord de la province de Québec, la baie d'Hudson, L'Ungava." The June number features an analytical article, "Les ordonnances des six premiers intendants de la Nouvelle-France."

Recent discoveries attributed to early man in America, by Ales Hrdlicka, and *Kutenai tales*, by Franz Boas, are works of anthropological interest (Washington: Government printing office, 1918. 387 p. and 67 p.).

Benjamin Sulte attempts to settle a somewhat illusive question in the *Memoires de la société royale du Canada* in the December, 1918-March, 1919 number. His paper is headed "Nos ancêtres etaient-ils ignorants?" In section II of the *Transactions* is an interesting paper by Sir Robert A. Falconer: "1776 and 1914, a contrast in British colonial action."

"Factors in the historical evolution of Mexico," a sketch in interpretive history by T. Esquivel Obregón, may be found in the *Hispanic American historical review* for May, 1919.

"Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Spanish colonies," a discussion of the southwest under the Spanish régime, has been contributed to the *Catholic historical review* for April, 1919, by the Reverend E. A. Ryan.

Carl Holliday, in his contribution to the *Sewanee review*, April-June, 1919, called "American folk-songs," has done much by way of giving to the average reader the historical setting for his favorite American songs. Even ephemeral facts connected with the origin of our folk-songs and now forgotten have been unearthed by the author in an article pleasing both for content and style.

The negro exodus to the north, its causes, scope, and consequences has been made the subject of investigation on the part of the United States department of labor, through the department of negro economics. "Negro migration in 1916-1917" is based on field work and investigation carried on by R. H. Leavell, Francis D. Tyson of the University of Pittsburgh, and others. The causes of the migration to the north are, broadly speaking, of two kinds — economic and social. Many other reasons for the lure of the north are offered, but in the main they fall within the classification suggested above. The studies are based on statistics which are by no means rigid an dinflexible, but the conclusions are on the whole substantiated by carefully selected data.

Robert E. Park of the University of Chicago is the author of a scholarly analysis of negro race psychology in a paper contributed to the *Journal of negro history*, April, 1919. "The conflict and fusion of cultures with special reference to the negro, discusses the resultant of the adjustment of African heritage to American culture.

In a paper contributed to the current number of the *Journal of negro history*, Charles H. Wesley discusses "The employment of negroes as

soldiers in the confederate army.'' After outlining the complexities of the problem, the fear of servile insurrection, the inborn sense of racial superiority, the apprehension of the loss of economic control of the negroes through such a measure, emphasis is laid upon the importance of the problem to the south, as contrasted with a north of greater resources and more remote contact with the race.

Milledge L. Bonham Jr. has been appointed to the chair of history at Hamilton college, Clinton, New York; he will take up his new duties September 10.

''Peter Sailly (1754-1826), a pioneer of the Champlain valley, with extracts from his diary and letters,'' by George S. Bixby, is published as *History bulletin* number 12 of the New York state library. It is the story of an immigrant from France to New York whose experiences are typical in many ways of the pioneers of the Champlain region.

''The Lenni Lenape, or Delaware Indians,'' originally an address before the New Jersey historical society by Edwin Robert Walker, has made its appearance in pamphlet form. Mr. Walker, basing his conclusions on both legendary and documentary sources, discusses the position of the Indian in New Jersey from the earliest days until the westward migration.

''Washington at Valley Forge'' is an address given by Hampton L. Carson before the Pennsylvania society of Sons of the revolution, and published in the *Pennsylvania magazine of history and biography* for April, 1919.

Earl G. Swem, assistant librarian of the state of Virginia, has contributed two more biographical numbers to the *Bulletin* of the Virginia state library. The first is for July-October, 1918; the article is entitled ''An analysis of Ruffin's *Farmers' register*, with a bibliography of Edmund Ruffin.'' The second is for January-April, 1919, and is entitled ''The acts and the journals of the general assembly of the colony, 1619-1776.''

Appended to the fifteenth annual report of the library board of the Virginia state library are some documents on Virginia in the revolutionary war. H. R. McIlwaine, librarian of the Virginia state library, has edited the documents of the ''Proceedings of the committees of safety of Cumberland and Isle of Wight counties, Virginia, 1775-1776.''

In the *North Carolina booklet* for January, 1919, appears the first part of a brief but compact biography of General John Steele. It

has been said of him that "North Carolina has produced few individuals whose public services offer more interesting topics for history and biography"; and yet no account of him deserving mention has ever appeared in print. He was a member of the first and second United States congresses, and comptroller of the treasury under Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. He declined the office of secretary of the treasury offered him by Adams. Among his friends and familiar correspondents were Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, Oliver Wolcott, Archibald Henderson, Albert Gallatin, Nathaniel Macon, and others. This biography by Archibald Henderson contains brief selections from General Steele's correspondence.

"County government and county affairs in North Carolina" is a miscellany of studies undertaken by E. C. Branson and others. The surveys are based on field and research work performed by educators, county and state officials. Many important civic and rural problems are considered and remedial measures are offered. (*North Carolina club year book*, 1917-1918, published by the University of North Carolina. 188 p. $.75).

"Joseph West: landgrave and governor," and "An Indian land grant in 1734," are two papers in the *South Carolina historical and genealogical magazine*, October, 1918. Henry A. M. Smith has begun the publication of "The Ashley river: its seats and settlements," in the same periodical for January, 1919.

"Tennessee, the compromise of 1850, and the Nashville convention," by St. George L. Sioussat, has been reprinted from the MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW in the *Tennessee historical magazine* for December, 1918. "Indian wars and warriors of the old southwest, 1730-1807," by Albert V. Goodpasture, is included in the same issue of the magazine. There is a possibility of its appearance in book form at some future date.

Mr. Otto A. Rothert, who is gathering material for a volume on Madison Cawein, Kentucky's nature poet, will welcome any letters that Cawein wrote that might add to an interpretation of his life and character. The book will be issued as a Filson club publication during or before December, 1920. Mr. Rothert is secretary of the Filson club of Louisville, Kentucky.

Wilmer C. Harris of the department of history, Ohio state university, Columbus, Ohio, has accepted the position of head of the history department at Butler college, Indianapolis.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, of the department of American history of Ohio state university, is to be head of the department of history in the University of Iowa.

Claiming that although much has been written on the life and achievements of Salmon Portland Chase, historians and biographers have glossed over one aspect of his life, Arthur Meier Schlesinger sets out to remedy the omission. His study is entitled "Salmon Portland Chase—undergraduate and pedagogue," and appears in the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* for April, 1919. He introduces a number of letters recently acquired by the Ohio state archeological and historical society, written by Chase to his collge friend, Thomas Sparhawk. The letters are indeed a valuable contribution to an interpretive estimate of Salmon P. Chase. Clarence E. Carter contributes "Some notes on Ohio historiography" to the same issue of the *Quarterly.*

The last general assembly of Indiana appropriated $20,000 to be used by the Indiana historical commission in collecting and organizing historical data relating to the state's part in the recent war. John W. Oliver, formerly associated with the commission during the activities of the centennial year, has been put in charge of this phase of the commission's work.

The Indiana historical commission has just published, under the editorship of Harlow Lindley, its secretary, a complete history of the centennial year's activities. The volume consists of 450 pages and is illustrated.

The Indiana history seminary of Indiana university is continuing the collection of speeches and biographical data of Indiana senators. Considerable headway has been made with collections on Thomas A. Hendricks, Joseph E. McDonald, David Turpie, Oliver P. Morton, and Henry S. Lane. The work was interrupted by the war, but is now in progress again. The seminary will welcome any material on this subject. Data may be sent to Mr. Logan Esarey of the Indiana historical survey.

John E. Iglehart is the author of a monograph in the *Indiana magazine of history* for June, 1919: "The coming of the English to Indiana in 1817 and their Hoosier neighbors." Strictly speaking the paper suggests the narrative or reminiscence rather than formal history. The author, however, has dipped widely into secondary and source material for his information, and is further aided in his discussion of the subject by close personal connection with the earliest English settlers

in the Hoosier state. Yet this advantage is at times offset by a blurred vision which is due to too close proximity to the subject under observation. Several pages are devoted, for instance, to prove that Eggleston's *Hoosier school master* is representative "of low life only . . . and should be excluded as a history of the better class of Hoosiers of that time." Then, too, the paper, despite the fact that it purports to treat of Hoosier settlers, devotes a comparatively large amount of space to neighboring settlements in Illinois.

"Nearly all of the history of War in Indiana, so far as it relates to the invasion of the State by hostile troops" can be told, according to Louis B. Ewbank, in the story of "Morgan's raid in Indiana." His monograph is published as number 2, volume VII, of the Indiana historical society's *Publications.*

On the whole, much should be said in praise of the monograph. It is written with an ease and familiarity to which many formal historians have become strangers; it is based on extensive source and secondary material which has been well assimilated in intensive research; and it makes interesting reading.

The Illinois legislature at its recent session appropriated the sum of $20,000 to be used during the next biennial period for the collection of material pertaining to Illinois' part in the great war. The Illinois state historical society has been designated as the responsible agency; it in turn has created a war records section, with headquarters in Springfield, to be in immediate charge of the work, and has appointed as war records secretary Mr. Wayne E. Stevens, recently associated with the historical branch of the general staff at Washington. It will be the ultimate purpose of the war records section to publish a comprehensive history of Illinois in the war, comprising probably some eight or ten volumes, which will cover all phases of the war activities of the state, economic and social as well as military; certain of the volumes will be devoted to documentary material. It is planned to engage the coöperation of local committees in the task of collecting material.

Illinois pioneer days is the title of a booklet of scrappy reminiscences of which Elbert Waller is the author (Litchfield, Illinois: E. B. Lewis, 1919. $.25). In the brief compass of eighty pages, "Pioneer home life," "Camp meetings," "Freak lawsuits of pioneer days," and many similar topics are discussed. The book is neither history nor narrative, but in the hands of a writer might easily be utilized as material for a novel of the well-known "Hoosier" type, — a type of fiction in which Illinois is sadly lacking.

The Reverend Frederick Beuckman is the author of a study entitled "The commons of Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Prairie du Rocher," in the *Illinois Catholic historical review* for April, 1919. The Reverend Beuckman cites the commons and common fields of the Illinois country as evidence of the priority of that region as a home for white settlers in the Mississippi valley. In "Old Kaskaskia ways and days," Stuart Brown begins the story of the earliest French occupation in Illinois. Little that is new is found here, but the incidents, although well known, are handled with a refreshing familiarity. In the same issue Joseph J. Thompson begins a sketch of "Illinois' first citizen — Pierre Gibault," and the Reverend Robert Hynes contributes "The old church at Cahokia."

Nancy Duffy Clark contributes an interesting sketch to the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* for April, 1918. It is a description of "An old Mormon town, Nauvoo, Illinois,"—a sleepy town, suggesting the charm and romance of a Rip Van Winkle,—which served first as the home of a religious experiment, and later, under Etienne Cabet, as the stage for a French commune.

Carl R. Miller is the author of "Journalism in Illinois before the thirties," an interesting sketch contributed to the same publication for July, 1918, recently off the press.

Delightfully reminiscent is the story told by Addison G. Procter, "Lincoln and the convention of 1860." Speaking from a wealth of personal experience, Mr. Procter, himself a delegate from Kansas to the convention that nominated Lincoln for the presidency in 1860, is able to give an intimate picture of those stirring days and of the men who helped nominate "the Illinois rail-splitter." The paper was read before the Chicago historical society on April 4, 1918, and has since been printed by the society.

"Cyrus Woodman: a character sketch," by Ellis B. Usher, and "Recollections of early Racine," by Appleton Morgan, are two papers of interest in the *Wisconsin magazine of history* for June, 1919.

For the adequate collection and preservation of war materials the Minnesota war records commission has been established. Solon J. Buck, superintendent of the Minnesota historical society, is chairman of the commission.

Whether it is due to the James Fenimore Cooper tradition which would have us believe the redskin a kind of tarnished edition of "nature's gentleman," or perhaps for some other less apparent reason, Indian tales and sketches are of perennial interest to the American reader, whether he be in his teens or an octogenarian. It is with a

thrill of anticipation that one opens the pages of the *Minnesota history bulletin* for November, 1918, and turns to the "Dakota portraits," a series of Indian sketches written by the Reverend Stephen R. Riggs, and published in the *Minnesota Free Press* at irregular intervals in 1858. Under poetic and fantastic names, "Gray leaf," "Sleepy eyes," "Rattling cloud," "Scarlet Bird," and the like, many interesting tales are introduced. The series of "portraits" is ably edited by Willoughby M. Babcock Jr. of the Minnesota historical society.

An excellent example of a state history designed for use as a school textbook appears in Mary Vance Carney's *Minnesota, the star of the north* (New York: D. C. Heath and company, 1918. 249 p.). In the main accurate, well proportioned, readable, and otherwise suited to its purpose, a noteworthy feature of the book is the attempt made to correlate the development of Minnesota with the general course of American history. Though intended for the young, the book could be used with profit by mature readers who want a bird's-eye view of Minnesota history.

In "America's fight for public opinion," Guy Stanton Ford tells of the work carried on by the committee of public information both at home and abroad, in presenting to as large an audience as possible America's motives for entering the war and the issues for which she was fighting. The address is published in the *Minnesota history bulletin* for February, 1919.

The "Twentieth biennial report for the years 1917-1918" has been published as the *Supplement* to the *Minnesota history bulletin* for February, 1919.

Miss Ruth A. Gallaher has revised a former outline for an Iowa war history and presented it in the March, 1919, issue of *Iowa and war,* under the heading "A tentative outline for a state war history."

What part the alumni, students, and faculty of the state university of Iowa played in the world war is to be recorded in a work, now in the process of preparation, which is being directed by C. H. Weller.

"The diplomatic relations of England with the quadruple alliance, 1815 - 1830," by Myrna Boyce, is a paper recently published by the University of Iowa in its *Studies in the social sciences.*

Much has been said in recent times on the subject of Americanization. Effort is to be made the country over to transform the alien into the responsible citizen,— one who realizes and fulfills his obligations to the state. Clarence Ray Aurner, in the *Iowa journal of history and politics* for April, 1919, looks at the subject from a new angle. It has occurred to him to examine the field with the purpose of finding out how the native-born American has acquired his preparation for citizen-

ship. In a study entitled "Historical survey of civic instruction and training for citizenship in Iowa," Mr. Aurner traces the historical development of civic instruction from 1854 to the present, the purpose of this training, to quote from an early address, being to "instruct every embryo American citizen in the elements of *republican government*, of the *relation of capital and labor*, of *rulers* and *people*." Evidently Americanization, like charity, should begin at home.

J. L. Kingsbury has resumed his work in the history department of the North East Missouri state teachers' college at Kirksville, Missouri. He spent the past year as instructor in history in the Lincoln high school at Teachers' college, Columbia university.

The Adair county (Missouri) historical society has assumed the task of raising $25,000 from the citizens of the county with which to erect a monument in honor of the thirty-five boys from Adair county who lost their lives in the recent war. The society is at present in its third year. E. M. Violette of the history department of the state teachers' college at Kirksville is secretary.

Whether Bolshevism be a dread scourge or the prophetic thunder heralding a new age, David R. Francis, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, has the distinction of having had the opportunity of personal contact with this new political phenomenon. Briefly and somewhat clumsily, his story is told by Walter B. Steven in the *Missouri historical review* for April, 1919, under the heading "Missourians abroad." But little source or official material is introduced by the writer.

Dr. N. A. N. Cleven, formerly of the San Diego junior college and now of the war trade board, has accepted a position as assistant professor of history and political science in the University of Arkansas.

The attempt of the confederate government during the civil war "to form a class alliance with its neighbor on the South" is discussed in an article by J. Fred Rippy in the *Southwestern historical quarterly* for April, 1919. "The Mexican projects of the confederates" were expressed in diplomatic missions both to the French and Mexican parties, and in colonization schemes promulgated by many enterprising confederates.

The Wyoming historical society has published a pamphlet of *Miscellanies* for 1919. The articles have been selected from the archives of the Wyoming historical society. Appended to the *Miscellanies* is the biennial report of the Wyoming historical society, 1916 - 1918, by Agnes R. Wright, state librarian. Much stress is laid in the report on the in-

adequate provisions made for the collection and care of documents, and also on the fact that there is a great lack of facilities for the preservation of war records.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

Published quarterly at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This notice required by the Act of Congress of August 12, 1912.

Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Urbana, Illinois.

Managing Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Urbana, Illinois.

Business Manager, Clara S. Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Publisher, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Owner, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.

There are no bond holders, mortgages, or other security holders.

CLARA S. PAINE, Secretary.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 26th day of March, 1919, by Clara S. Paine, Secretary.

MAX WESTERMAN, Notary Public.
(My commission expires August 4, 1921)

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. VI, NO. 3 DECEMBER, 1919

NEW LIGHT ON DON DIEGO DE PENALOSA: PROOF THAT HE NEVER MADE AN EXPEDITION FROM SANTA FE TO QUIVIRA AND THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER IN 1662[1]

Between the years 1678 and 1684 Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa Briceño y Berdugo, a discredited and exiled governor of the province of New Mexico in New Spain, made his three well-known proposals to Louis XIV to attack New Spain in the name of France. The first of these propositions, presented in 1678, looked toward the conquest of the region to the northeast and east of New Mexico, known as Quivira and Tegago (Teguayo),[2] probably the region between modern Wichita, Kansas, and the Wichita mountains in the present state of Oklahoma.[3] The second proposal, made in 1682, called for the founding of a French settlement at the mouth of the Rio Bravo (Rio Grande).[4] In the third proposal, presented two years later and at exactly

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Louis, May 8, 1919.

[2] "Real cédula comunicando al virey de Nueva España, pidiendo informe acerca del reino de Quivira," in Fernández Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira: informe presentado á la Real academia de la historia* (Madrid, 1882), 50 ff.

[3] Herbert E. Bolton, *Spanish exploration in the southwest, 1542-1706* (New York, 1916), 205; F. W. Hodge, note, in Benavides, *Memorial of 1630* (Ayer translation — Chicago, 1916), 278.

[4] "Mémoire pour Mgr. le marquis de Seignelay, touchant l'établissement d'une nouvelle colonie dans la Floride, dans l'embouchure de la rivière appelée Rio-Bravo, et les avantages qui en peuvent revenir au roy et à ses sujets," in Pierre Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français dans l'ouest et dans le sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale* (Paris, 1879), 3: 44 ff.; English translation in John G. Shea, *The expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa, governor of New Mexico, from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662* (New York, 1882), 12.

the same time that La Salle was making preparations to found a settlement at the mouth of the Mississippi river, Peñalosa offered to seize Pánuco (Tampico), and make it a base for the conquest of the adjacent rich mining province of Nueva Vizcaya.[5]

As a result of the international importance attached to Peñalosa's proposals, his activities after leaving New Spain—his sojourn in England, his later residence in Paris, and the question of his connection with the La Salle expedition to the Texas coast—have been carefully investigated and their significance pointed out by students of French and Spanish colonization in America.[6] Of Peñalosa's activities in America, however, especially his record as governor of New Mexico and his trial and exile by the tribunal of the holy office of the inquisition, practically nothing has heretofore been written. In 1879, the French historian, Margry, published what is apparently a brief autobiographical sketch of Peñalosa,[7] and this, until recently, has constituted the chief *unquestioned* source for his career prior to his exile from New Spain. Yet so brief is this sketch that Houck, the well-known historian of Missouri, writing in 1908, says: "Very little is known about his administration of New Mexico while he was governor and captain-general of the province."[8] The same year, Lea in his admirable study, *The inquisition in the Spanish dependencies,* thus dismisses the Peñalosa episode: "Another Governor of New Mexico, Diego de Peñalosa, fared even worse when, for indiscreet words about priests and inquisitors and expressions verging on blasphemy, he was exposed to the humiliation of appearing as a penitent in

[5] "Mémoire sur les affaires de l'Amérique," in Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français,* 3: 48 ff.; English translation in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662,* 16 ff.

[6] See William E. Dunn, *Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702: the beginnings of Texas and Pensacola* (Austin, 1917), 13 ff.; Herbert E. Bolton, "The Spanish occupation of Texas, 1519-1690," in *Southwestern historical quarterly,* 16: 6, 17, and "Notes on 'Clark's Beginnings of Texas,'" in Texas state historical association, *The quarterly,* 12: 151 ff.; E. T. Miller, "The connection of Peñalosa with the LaSalle expedition," *ibid.,* 5: 97 ff.; E. Daenell, *Die Spanier in Nordamerika von 1513-1814* (Munich and Berlin, 1911), 99 ff.

[7] "Notice sur le Comte de Peñalosa," in Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français,* 3: 39 ff.; translation in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662,* 8 ff.

[8] Louis Houck, *A history of Missouri from the earliest explorations and settlements until the admission of the state into the union* (Chicago, 1908), 1: 141.

the auto de fe of February 3, 1668—thus virtually incapacitating him for further service."[9]

At the court of Louis XIV, Peñalosa capitalized his personal knowledge of the regions mentioned in his three proposals. In 1684, at the time that he offered to seize Pánuco, he presented to Monsieur de Seignelay, French minister of marine, a manuscript "Relacion,"[10] purporting to be an account of an expedition made by himself in 1662, while governor of New Mexico, to Quivira and beyond to the "Mischipi" river[11]—a stream thought by Houck to have been the Mississippi,[12] by Shea to have been the Missouri river.[13] This "Relacion," according to its title page, was written by Father Nicolás de Freytas, one of the Franciscan missionaries of New Mexico and the governor's chaplain.

The Freytas "Relacion" was published for the first time by John Gilmary Shea in 1882. Taking it as his authority, which he in no wise questioned, Shea hailed Peñalosa as a great explorer of the Quivira region.[14] Among scholars at large, however, the publication of the "Relacion" aroused great speculation. In Spain, the *Real academia de la historia* instructed one of its members, the erudite Fernández Duro, to investigate and report upon its authenticity. As a result of this investigation, Duro, before the end of the year 1882, published as his report a book entitled: *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira: informe presentado á la Real academia de la historia.*[15] In this book no definite facts are presented and no documentary material is cited which positively disprove the alleged expedition of Peñalosa in 1662. Duro, however, after

[9] Henry C. Lea, *The inquisition in the Spanish dependencies; Sicily — Naples — Sardinia — Milan — the Canaries — Mexico — Peru — New Granada* (New York, 1908), 256.

[10] "Relacion del descubrimiento del pais y ciudad de Quivira echo por D. Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa . . . escrita por el Padre Fr. Nicolas de Freytas," in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 25 ff.; and in Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira*, 33 ff.

[11] *Ibid.*; Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 5, 7, 25.

[12] Houck, *History of Missouri*, 1: 146.

[13] Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 5.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] See note 2.

considerable investigation in archive and printed source material, some of which he published, in addition to the Spanish text of the Freytas "Relacion," gives his conclusions as follows: first, that Peñalosa did not make such an expedition at all; second, that Father Freytas did not write the "Relacion"; and third, that Peñalosa forged the work, adding the name of Freytas when he moved to Paris in 1673.[16] Likewise, in America H. H. Bancroft in 1884—independently, as he claims, of Duro—came to the conclusion that the whole narrative was a fabrication, founded on Oñate's expedition nearly sixty years earlier, and that Peñalosa never made any such expedition.[17]

Since the time of Duro and Bancroft no attempt has been made, so far as is known, to prove or to disprove the authenticity of the Freytas "Relacion" and the claim made therein that Peñalosa made an expedition from Santa Fe in 1662 to what is now eastern Kansas and southern Missouri. True, most scholars have held to the belief that Peñalosa never made the expedition.[18] For lack of positive proof, however, no one since the Freytas "Relacion" was published in 1882 has hitherto been able to speak with certainty on this subject. Houck, though taking into account the fact that the "Relacion" generally has been discredited, says: "Without attempting to decide as to the truthfulness of Padre Freytas' narrative of this expedition of Peñalosa, we cannot well omit to give its details as recorded by him,

16 Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira*, 49.

17 Hubert H. Bancroft, *History of the North Mexican states and Texas* (San Francisco, 1884), 1: 386, and *Arizona and New Mexico* (San Francisco, 1889), 21, 24, 169. Bancroft arrived at these conclusions chiefly as a result of the fact that no mention is made of an expedition by Peñalosa to the eastern region in the famous report of Father Posadas, written shortly after 1685. Posadas was *custodio* of the Franciscan missions and *comisario* of the tribunal of the inquisition during the administration of Peñalosa in New Mexico, and the report which he made at the request of the viceroy deals chiefly with the region to the north and east of New Mexico. His failure to mention an expedition by Peñalosa at a time when he himself was living in New Mexico is excellent circumstantial evidence that Peñalosa never made the expedition which he alleges to have made. Such evidence, however, is only circumstantial. Posadas might have purposely omitted any reference to the expedition, for, as will be seen later, he and Peñalosa were the bitterest of enemies. See "Informe á S. M. sobre las tierras de Nuevo Méjico, Quivira y Teguayo," in Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira*, 53 ff.; Dunn, *Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States*, 63.

18 Bolton, "The Spanish occupation of Texas," in *Southwestern historical quarterly*, 16: 7.

leaving the reader to judge of the intrinsic probability of at least some of the main features of this narrative."[19] Then, with the "Relacion" as his guide, Houck attempts to locate in a general way the regions and rivers mentioned in the narrative. Concluding, he says: "The fact that the narrative of Freytas exaggerates and magnifies the discoveries and population of the countries through which he says Peñalosa marched is in and of itself not sufficient reason for us to discredit this expedition entirely."[20]

It is purposed now, however, to show positively that Peñalosa never made an expedition eastward from New Mexico in 1662. It is also purposed to relate, for the first time, some of the episodes in his troubled administration, and to supplement and correct Lea's brief statement concerning his trial by the inquisition, the outcome of which trial made him, when later a veritable empire — the Mississippi valley itself — was at stake, the cause of the deepest concern to two of the oldest and proudest courts of Europe.

In this connection a brief bibliographical note is in order. In 1912, while searching in the archives of Mexico, the late Mr. Adolph F. Bandelier made transcripts of a great many of the papers of the inquisition. Among these papers were documents dealing with the trial and conviction of Don Diego de Peñalosa for blasphemy, impeding the jurisdiction of the inquisition, and other crimes. After the death of Bandelier, who had been able by a special grant from the Carnegie institution of Washington to continue his investigations in Seville, Spain, his transcripts of the inquisition papers, and many others, were entrusted to the present writer to translate and edit for publication for the Carnegie institution.[21] The inquisition papers, referred to above, throw much interesting and valuable light upon the activities of Peñalosa and his predecessor, Don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, as governors of New Mexico. The utilization of these transcripts by the writer has made possible this paper,

[19] Houck, *History of Missouri*, 1: 142.

[20] *Ibid.*, 1: 143.

[21] See J. Franklin Jameson, "Annual report of the director of the department of historical research," in Carnegie institution of Washington, *Year book number 17, for the year 1918* (Washington, 1919), 145.

which may be regarded as the first fruits of the final labors of the lamented Bandelier in the archives of Mexico and Spain.

On December 24, 1658, Don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, newly-appointed governor of New Mexico, left Mexico City for Santa Fe. Accompanying him were the *custodio*, Fray Juan Ramírez, Fray Nicolás de Freytas, Fray Miguel de Guebara, and sixteen other Franciscan missionaries.[22] Of Freytas, who was then but twenty-four years old, and of Guebara, more will be heard; Father Freytas is the reputed author of the so-called Freytas "Relacion," Father Guebara is named in the "Relacion" as chaplain of the Quivira expedition. En route to New Mexico there were many quarrels between Mendizábal and the religious.[23] Mendizábal made many claims to extraordinary powers, and even pretended to have secret instructions from Viceroy Albuquerque to strangle or hang the religious or to banish them ignominiously from the province.[24] In July, 1659, Mendizábal and his retinue reached Santa Fe,[25] where he was to exercise the duties of governor until the latter part of 1661. During this period Mendizábal completely alienated all classes save a few of his own favorites and appointees. Especially did he antagonize and persecute the religious. So serious, in fact, was his persecution of this group that he came to be called Attila by everyone,[26] and within a year after his arrival the missionaries had decided, provided no relief should be forthcoming, to consume the sacrament in all the churches of the province and depart therefrom.[27]

Mendizábal, however, was not unopposed in his high-handed acts and presumptuous claims. In particular did Fathers Nico-

22 "Testificacion de Fray Nicolas de Freytas, México, Enero 24, 1661," in *Segundo quaderno del proceso á Mendizabal*, 63 ff. (Inquisicion, A. G. M., tomo 1660; transcript in the Bandelier collection); "Primera audiencia de Don Bernardo López de Mendizabal," f. 143 (Ramo de inquisicion, A. G. M., tomo 1663; transcript in the Bandelier collection).

23 *Ibid.*

24 *Ibid.*, ff. 45, 50.

25 "Testificacion de Don Juan Manso, México, 13 de Enero 1661," in *Segundo quaderno del proceso á Mendizabal*, f. 46.

26 "Ratification de Miguel de Noriega, Santa Fé y 22 de Septiembre de 1661," in *Causa del fiscal del Santo Oficio contra Bernardo López de Mendizabal*," f. 51 (Inquisicion, A. G. M., tomo 1662; transcript in Bandelier collection).

27 "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 53.

lás de Freytas and Miguel de Guebara take issue with him.[28] In June, 1660, Father Freytas charged Mendizábal with having publicly said that "he proposed to become the only and supreme head of the church," which, added Freytas, "he has fulfilled so far as I am concerned." This was followed by Freytas formally resigning his guardianship and ministry.[29] Early in the next year he was in Mexico and there he preferred many charges before the tribunal of the inquisition against Mendizábal.[30]

Prior to this, however, the many complaints against Mendizábal had resulted in his recall by the civil authorities and the selection of Peñalosa as governor in his stead. Peñalosa's commission as governor and captain-general of New Mexico was issued at the end of 1660 and he proceeded to his charge in 1661.[31] By June of the latter year the well-known mining town of Cuencamé, in central Nueva Vizcaya, had been reached.[32] With Peñalosa at this time was Father Freytas, who was now

[28] "Declaracion de Fray Juan Ramirez, México, Mayo 14 de 1660," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 10; "Audiencia, Febrero 26, 1661," in *Causa contra Nicolas de Aguilar*, f. 32 ff. (Inquisicion, A. G. M., tomo 235; transcript in Bandelier collection).

[29] "Carta de Fray Nicolas de Freytas, Cuarac, Junio 18 de 1660," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 26 ff.; see also "Deposicion de Nicolas de Aguilar, Mayo 8 de 1663," *ibid.*, f. 224.

[30] "Declaracion de Fray Nicolas de Freitas, México 10 de Enero 1661," in *Causa contra Aguilar*, f. 25; "Audiencia de 21 de Febrero de 1661, Mexico," *ibid.*, f. 27; "Testificacion de Fray Nicolas de Freitas, Mexico, Enero 24, 1661," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 63.

[31] "Notice sur le Comte de Peñalosa," in Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français*, 3: 42; English translation in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 10. On June 25, 1665, Peñalosa testified that he was a native of the city of Lima; that his father was Alonzo de Peñalosa, a resident of La Paz and an *encomendero* of Huarina; that he was between forty-three and forty-four years old; and that he had been in Mexico eleven years. There he had been employed in the higher positions, political and military, in the king's service. "Testificacion de Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa Briceño. México, Junio 25 de 1665," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 231; "Primera audiencia, Junio 25 de 1665," in *Causa contra Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa Briceño y Berdugo, governador que fue de Nuevo Mexico, por blasfemo i impedimento del uso del Santo oficio y otros delictos*, p. 26 (Inquisicion, A. G. M., tomo 1663; transcript in Bandelier collection. References to this *expediente* are to the pages of the Bandelier transcripts, due to the fact that, in this case, Bandelier did not give all the archive folio numbers).

[32] "Testimonio de Juan de los Reyes Marchena, Julio 15 de 1661," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 160.

returning to New Mexico, according to claims advanced later, with an order of the tribunal calling for the arrest of Mendizábal.[33] Between Father Freytas and Governor Peñalosa there was soon to develop a friendship as marked as was the hatred of Freytas for Mendizábal.

Mendizábal, however, was not arrested upon the arrival of Peñalosa and Freytas, some time after the first of August, 1661, the latter apparently employing himself in secretly securing depositions to be forwarded to the tribunal of the inquisition. Just what were the relations between Peñalosa and his predecessor is not clear, but by November, 1661, Peñalosa was functioning in Santa Fe as governor.[34] As was customary, after he had been inducted into office Peñalosa held the *residencia* — an official investigation into the conduct in office — of his predecessor. If a later statement by Peñalosa is correct, Mendizábal at this time offered his successor 6,000 *pesos* to get him safely through the *residencia*;[35] if one may believe Mendizábal's wife, Peñalosa's price was higher than 6,000 *pesos*, for when he had completed the *residencia* a messenger was sent to tell Mendizábal that if he would give Peñalosa 10,000 *pesos*, he might write the record of the *residencia* as he pleased, and might scratch out the records as they had been taken.[36]

Some time before holy week of 1662, Peñalosa had learned from Father Freytas and others of the order of the tribunal of the inquisition calling for the arrest of Mendizábal and the attachment of his goods.[37] At first Peñalosa offered to assist Mendizábal to flee, and even suggested to Mendizábal's wife that for one thousand *pesos* he would desist from his persecution.[38] Later, when Mendizábal would not consent to allowing his goods to be sold by Peñalosa, he was imprisoned in his own house at Santa Fe, where a strong guard was placed over

[33] Statement of Peñalosa, in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 160.

[34] "Testificacion de Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa Briceño, México, Junio 25 de 1665," *ibid.*, f. 231 ff.; "Audiencia de Julio 1 de 1665," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 22.

[35] "Audiencia de Diciembre 4 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 27.

[36] "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 3.

[37] "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," ff. 8, 263.

[38] *Ibid.*, 263; "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 3.

him; afterward he was transferred from his own house to other quarters, and Peñalosa proceeded to sack the house and carry away for his own use whatever suited his fancy.[39] He even unswung the bed, but on returning from sacking the house he remarked: "I leave there for the inquisitors over three thousand *pesos;* let them be content if they will, or let them seek for more on Don Bernardo's *hacienda.*"[40] Not being able to blackmail Mendizábal, it is clear that Peñalosa's object in imprisoning him was to get possession of his property before his formal arrest by the inquisition.[41] For it was customary in such cases, pending the outcome of the trial before the tribunal, for the property of the person arrested to be attached in the name of the inquisition.[42]

Thus it was that Peñalosa made himself liable to the charge of impeding and complicating the execution of the decree of the tribunal. When Mendizábal protested to Father Posadas, the new Franciscan *custodio* and *comisario* of the inquisition,[43] and asked that his goods be restored to him, the latter is said to have asked what recourse was possible "when Don Diego de Peñalosa was governor."[44] The order calling for Mendizábal's arrest not having been received by Father Posadas, he was powerless to act.

At this time Peñalosa is reputed to have said that the members of the inquisition tribunal were all rascals; that if the tribunal were present, not only would he not obey it, but he would attack with a dagger any superior minister of that body who

[39] "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," ff. 8, 24, 265; "Declaracion de Don Bernardo Lopez de Mendizabal, México, Abril 28 de 1663," in *Causa cotnra Peñalosa,* p. 1. Among the effects of Mendizábal were twelve hundred skins, valued at about twelve hundred *pesos.* "Declaracion de Hernando Martin Serrano, Santa Fé, Mayo 21 de 1664," *ibid.,* p. 15.

[40] "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 24.

[41] Peñalosa, "having notice of the command of this tribunal to seize the accused and attach his goods, not only tried to sell the accused's goods, which would have impeded the order of the tribunal, but . . . did . . . send him" to another prison. *Ibid.*

[42] "The Inquisition was expected to become self-supporting from confiscations, fines, and pecuniary penances." Lea, *The inquisition in the Spanish dependencies,* 212.

[43] Father Posadas arrived in New Mexico on April 28, 1661. "Carta de Fray Alonso de Posadas, al Santo Oficio, Mayo 23 de 1661," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal,* f. 162.

[44] *Ibid.*; "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 24.

might oppose him; and that he himself was going to preside over that body. Peñalosa also boasted publicly that he had, under orders from some of the superior ministers of the tribunal, drawn up the charges against Mendizábal, all of which had been made at his own discretion.[45]

In the meantime the warmest affection had developed between Peñalosa and Father Freytas. Soon after his arrival, Freytas said in a sermon that God had brought Peñalosa to take the church out of the power of a heretic.[46]. Freytas served as the governor's confessor and lived and dined regularly with him,[47] the two playing cards in the government building to while away the time.[48] That Peñalosa, Freytas, and Guebara maintained concubines was public scandal.[49] At the same time so great was the hatred of Father Freytas for Mendizábal that he went from house to house to ask that no one knead bread for him or his wife; in some instances he even forbade, and threatened with evil, any one who did so.[50]

Even before the arrest of Mendizábal by Peñalosa, the latter had been planning an expedition to the Moqui provinces in what is now northeastern Arizona, and not to the plains of Kansas, as the following facts will show. On Thursday before the second Sunday in Lent, Father Posadas was in Santa Fe, where he expressed his intention of preaching in the church of the *villa* on the following Sunday. The next day, Friday, Father Freytas, the *guardian* of the *villa*, informed Father Posadas that Peñalosa "had ordered him to sing a mass on Saturday and to uncover the holy sacrament, to the end that he, the governor, might have a happy journey while on an expedition which he was going to make to the province of Moqui."[51]

[45] "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 24; "Declaracion de Don Bernardo Lopez de Mendizabal, México, Abril 28 de 1663," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 1.

[46] "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 3.

[47] "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 265.

[48] "Testificacion de Rodrigo Rubin, Agosto 3 de 1663," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 3.

[49] "Audiencia de Diciembre 11 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 29; "Declaracion de algunas cosas por Peñalosa," *ibid.*, p. 30; "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 179.

[50] "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 3.

[51] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas, al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Mayo 24 de 1662," *ibid.*, p. 5.

Father Freytas carried out the governor's instructions to the letter. For the service Peñalosa entered on horseback as far as the high altar of the church Notwithstanding this unusual proceeding, Father Freytas ordered the ceremony performed, and not only gave Peñalosa the sacrament to kiss but he himself placed the sacrament on Peñalosa's head, "to the horror and scandal of all the settlers." Freytas excused such conduct on the ground that a similar ceremony had been held for the Duke of Albuquerque. Father Posadas, however, not only disapproved of the occurrence but promptly reported it to the tribunal of the inquisition.[52]

Some time after the imprisonment of Mendizábal — which was just before Easter week — and the first day of April, 1662, Peñalosa with twenty picked soldiers left Santa Fe for the Moqui *pueblos,* distant about one hundred leagues to the west.[53] As Easter in 1662 fell on March 30,[54] the date of Peñalosa's departure was probably between the twentieth and the last day of March. At any rate he had departed for Moqui by April 1, 1662.[55] This and other facts to be noted later proved conclusively that Peñalosa did not set out for Quivira in March, 1662, and that the Freytas "Relacion," which was presented to Louis XIV in 1684 as authority for this alleged expedition, is a fabrication. For, according to that "Relacion," Peñalosa, accompanied by Fathers Freytas and Guebara and some eighty civilians, in addition to a large force of Indians, was marching during the months of March, April, May, and part of June from Santa Fe to Quivira and the "Mischipi" river.[56]

Among those who accompanied Peñalosa on his expedition to

[52] *Ibid.*; "Declaracion de Don Bernardo Lopez de Mendizabal, México, Abril 28 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 2; "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," f. 207.

[53] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa,* p. 6; "Declaracion de Andres Posadas al Gobernador Juan de Miranda, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 20.

[54] *Whittaker's almanac* (London, 1918), 73.

[55] Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa,* p. 6; "Declaracion de Andres Lopez Zambrano, Santo Domingo, Febrero 20, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 10.

[56] "Relacion del descubrimiento del pais y ciudad de Quivira, echo por D. Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa . . . escrita por el Padre Fray Nicolas de Freytas," in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662,* 27 ff.; also in Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira,* 33 ff.

Moqui were Sargento Mayor Diego Romero and Alcalde Mayor Nicolás de Aguilar, two characters of the lowest type who were especially inimical to the religious of the province.[57] On April 1, 1662, while these two men were absent with Peñalosa on the Moqui expedition, Father Posadas received a letter from the tribunal of the inquisition containing orders for their arrest. This letter was brought to New Mexico by Alguacil Mayor Juan Manso, the predecessor of Governor Mendizábal.[58] On April 30, 1662, the Peñalosa party arrived at Isleta on its return from Moqui.[59] At that time Father Posadas was distant some eighteen leagues from Isleta; but being advised by letter that Peñalosa, accompanied by Romero and Aguilar, had arrived at the latter *pueblo*, he set out posthaste on the morning of May 1 for that place, arriving about midnight. The next day, Father Posadas, in the absence of General Manso, arrested both Romero and Aguilar.[60] Peñalosa, meanwhile, had gone on to Santa Fe, but he was promptly advised of the arrests by one of his lieutenants. Posadas by this time had crossed the river on a raft and secretly made his way to Santo Domingo, fifteen leagues above Isleta, where Romero and Aguilar and two other prisoners were incarcerated in the cells of the monastery.[61]

Having secured his prisoners, Father Posadas set about to prevent, as he claims to have done in the cases of other arrests, any one from taking over their *encomiendas*, for he knew full well, he said, "that the governor wanted to take them over." As a matter of fact, as soon as Peñalosa was advised of the arrest of Romero and Aguilar, he sent to have their weapons and other property collected for himself. Father Posadas, how-

[57] "Declaracion de Diego Romero, año de 1663," in *Causa contra Aguilar*, f. 66.

[58] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 6; "Testificacion de Don Juan Manso, México, 13 de Enero de 1661," in *Segundo quaderno á Mendizabal*, f. 46; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Santo Domingo, Junio 1 de 1662," in *Causa contra Aguilar*, f. 74 ff.

[59] "Testimonio de Fray Salvador de Guerra, Junio 13, 1662," *ibid.*, 80; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 6; "Declaracion de Diego Romero, México, Mayo 5 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 3; "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 3.

[60] "Testimonio de Fray Salvador de Guerra, Junio 13 de 1662," in *Causa contra Aguilar*, f. 80.

[61] *Ibid.*, 81.

ever, issued orders in the name of the inquisition for Peñalosa's *alcalde mayor* not to take over the *encomiendas*. Thwarted in his intentions, Peñalosa was deeply offended and at once instituted proceedings to get possession of the property, at the same time making complaint as to the competency of Father Posadas' jurisdiction as *comisario* of the holy inquisition.[62]

In the meantime Father Posadas had gone to the Mansos missions in the present El Paso region, and from there, on May 24, he safely wrote a letter to the tribunal advising it of Peñalosa's action. Eight days later he was again in Santo Domingo.[63] Two weeks after this, Peñalosa, while at Isleta — whither he had gone to be present at the baptism of a goddaughter — wrote a letter to Father Posadas full of accusations against the religious and the inquisition.[64] The letter in question was written on June 16, 1662. This is further proof that Peñalosa did not make an expedition to Quivira in 1662, for it was just five days prior to the date of this letter, according to the "Relacion" bearing the name of Father Freytas, that Peñalosa and his party began to retrace their steps from the wonderful city of Gran Quivira to Santa Fe.[65] Clearly the "Relacion" was entirely fictitious.

Whether or not Father Freytas brought an order from the inquisition calling for the arrest of Mendizábal in the name of that body, no such order was carried out. On August 19, 1662, however, Father Posadas received specific instructions from the tribunal to arrest both Mendizábal and his wife. The order was brought from Mexico by one Diego González Lobón, who first reported to the governor and then, accompanied by Father Freytas, carried the order to Father Posadas at Santo Domingo. As soon as he read the order, Father Posadas realized that to arrest Mendizábal for the tribunal would cause trouble, since the latter

[62] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Mayo 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 5; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," *ibid.*, p. 6.

[63] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Mayo 24 de 1662," *ibid.*, p. 5; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Santo Domingo, Junio 1 de 1662," in *Causa contra Aguilar*, f. 74 ff.

[64] "Carta de Diego de Peñalosa, al custodio, Ysleta, Junio 16 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 6.

[65] "Relacion del descubrimiento del pais y ciudad de Quivira, echo por D. Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa," in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 40; and in Duro, *Don Diego de Peñalosa, y su descubrimiento del reino de Quivira*, 39.

was still Peñalosa's prisoner. For this reason Posadas advised "the governor's best friend," Father Freytas, "cautiously and carefully" to ask Peñalosa to remove the guards, as he "had an imperative duty to perform." Freytas returned to Santa Fe; shortly afterward, instead of being removed, the guards about Mendizábal were commanded under penalty of death not to allow any one, no matter what his quality or condition, to take the ex-governor from his prison.[66] For some part in this action, Freytas was suspected by Father Posadas.

Nevertheless, on August 26, 1662, Father Posadas formally arrested Mendizábal. About the end of September or the beginning of October of that year, Mendizábal, a prisoner of the inquisition, left Santa Fe for Mexico City, where, on April 9, 1663, he was incarcerated in the secret prison by the inquisition authorities.[67] Father Posadas had checkmated Governor Peñalosa a second time.

At the same time Father Posadas arrested Mendizábal, he attached in behalf of the tribunal the latter's estate, which had previously been seized by Peñalosa.[68] This move infuriated Peñalosa, and from that time he persecuted the *comisario* of the inquisition in every way possible; he made inquiry into all the movements of Posadas, and made efforts to have laid before him all that the latter was doing in the name of the tribunal.[69] Thus the contest arising over the attachment of the *encomiendas* of Romero, Aguilar, and Mendizábal marked the beginning of a long struggle between Father Posadas, on the one hand, and the governor, supported by Fathers Freytas and Guebara, on the

[66] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, conversion de los Mansos, Noviembre 24 de 1662," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 6.

[67] "Declaracion de Don Bernardo Lopez de Mendizabal, México, Abril 28 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 1; "Primera audiencia de Mendizabal," ff. 2, 110. Mendizábal's trial was concluded in March, 1664. At the time Mendizábal was critically ill; he died in prison on September 16, 1664. On April 17, 1671, the inquisitors voted "that the memory of . . . Mendizábal should be absolved from the odium of the judgment, and that it should be declared and ordered that his body should be exhumed and his bones . . . placed in ecclesiastical burial." *Ibid.*, ff. 294, 301.

[68] "Declaracion de Andres Lopez de Zambrano, Santo Domingo, Febrero 20 de 1664," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 11; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 9.

[69] *Ibid.*; "Carta de Fray Antonio de Ybargaray al Tribunal, Galistéo, Octubre 1 de 1663," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 7.

other, over the general question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[70] In the long run Peñalosa, notwithstanding the sequestration of *encomiendas* and the confiscation of their rents by the tribunal of the inquisition, actually did collect for himself the revenue from several, including that of Romero.[71] In at least two instances the tributes were thus illegally collected for Peñalosa by Father Freytas.[72] In the case of Romero's *encomienda*, Peñalosa tried to make it appear that he had given it in trust to another immediately after Romero's arrest. As a matter of fact he delayed the actual transfer of the *encomienda* until just before leaving New Mexico.[73]

[70] "Carta de Fray Alonso de Posadas al Tribunal . . . Mayo 24 de 1662," *ibid.*, p. 5; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 9; "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 3.

According to one declarant, Fathers Freytas and Guebara "were great friends of Don Diego de Peñalosa and both eulogized him in the sermons which they preached; they also praised his actions excessively in indirect words, and vituperated those of their prelate . . . all their declarations being animated by the attachment which the *comisario* had laid on the estate which Don Diego de Peñalosa was taking for his own when it was not his." "Declaracion de Juana Alvizu, estancia de San Nicolas, Sandia, Marzo 26, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 18. According to another declarant, Father Freytas, during Lent of 1663, preached two sermons against Father Posadas, the latter being referred to as "Caiaphas" and "Judas." "Deposicion de Fray Bernardo Lopez de Covarrubias, guardian de San Marcos, Enero 17 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 17.

[71] "Declaracion del Capitan Cristóval Duran y Chavez, Marzo 9, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 17; "Ratificacion de Martin Serrano," *ibid.*, p. 15; "Declaracion de Juana Alvizu, estancia de San Nicolas, Sandia, Marzo 14 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 18.

Peñalosa, "with reference to the *encomiendas* of Francisco Gómez and Diego Romero, sent an order for the entire quota of October of the year 1662 to be collected in the town of Pecos, as was done; when the clothing pertaining to this *encomienda* was brought to the defendant, he kept it, not turning it over to any trustee whatever. This clothing consisted of nineteen *mantas* of cotton, forty-four pieces of cloth, sixty-six chamois skins, and twenty-one white buckskins, eighteen buffalo skins, and sixteen large buckskins. In the year 1663 half of the tribute was collected in the same manner in that town in the month of April. It consisted of twenty-nine large chamois skins, forty-two pieces of cloth, twelve buffalo skins, twelve white buckskins, and seven large ones. . ." "Audiencia del 3 de Julio de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 25.

[72] "Ratificacion de Martin Serrano," *ibid.*, p. 15.

[73] "Declaracion del Capitan Cristóval Duran y Chavez, Marzo 9, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 17.

"Not only did the defendant [Peñalosa] do as has been said with regard to the *encomiendas* of the prisoners, but he made a practice of anticipating the collections, receiving seven hundred and twenty-two pieces valued at one *peso* each in collections from the revenues belonging to Francisco Gómez, and one hundred and eighteen pieces of the same value from the revenues belonging to Diego Romero . . . and

This question of the sequestration of *encomiendas* in cases where the *encomenderos* were arrested by the tribunal of the inquisition was generally recognized at the time as the primary, though it was not the only, cause for friction between Peñalosa and Father Posadas.[74] One of the most serious disputes connected with the whole subject of ecclesiastical jurisdiction arose in the following way. Don Pedro Durán y Chávez, lieutenant-general of the province, was arrested by order of Peñalosa and was being carried in chains to Santa Fe, when he escaped from his guard and sought asylum in the church at Santo Domingo. As soon as he was advised of this, Peñalosa sent soldiers to Santo Domingo, who, on Sunday, August 23, 1663, after demanding the keys and being refused them, forcibly took the refugee from the church.[75] Claiming that he had authority from the pontiff to do so, Father Posadas promptly threatened to excommunicate Peñalosa unless Don Pedro was returned within twenty-four hours to the church in which he had sought refuge. Thereupon Peñalosa replied that with all due respect to the pontiff he would arrest Father Posadas, and this he promptly set about to do.[76]

On Sunday, the last day of September, 1663, after all necessary precautions had been taken to safeguard the undertaking, Peñalosa placed himself at the head of twelve mounted and armed citizens of Santa Fe and set out for the nearby *pueblo* of

he delayed the transfer of the title until the time when he was about to come to New Spain.'' ''Audiencia del 3 de Julio de 1665,'' *ibid.*, p. 25. After his imprisonment Peñalosa claimed that the tributes were always collected in halves, except for one year, and that the part thereof which belonged to the royal fisc was paid to the parish priests or to the persons whom the *comisario* himself designated. He also claimed that he had reported his action to the tribunal, the viceroy, and the *audiencia*. ''Respuesta de Diego de Peñalosa,'' *ibid.*, p. 26. No corroboratory evidence for these statements was submitted.

[74] ''Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664,'' in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 9; ''Carta de Fray Antonio de Ybargaray al Tribunal, Galistéo, Octubre 1 de 1663,'' *ibid.*, p. 7; ''Requerimiento de Ruiz de Zepeda al Tribunal, Mexico, Febrero 7 de 1664,'' *ibid.*, p. 8.

[75] ''Peticion é informe de Posadas al Gobernador Juan de Miranda, 1664,'' in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 20; ''Declaracion de Fray Gabriel de Torija, Santo Domingo, Junio 3, 1664,'' *ibid.*, p. 15.

[76] *Ibid.*; ''Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663,'' *ibid.*, p. 4; ''Carta de Fray Antonio de Ybargaray al Tribunal, Galistéo, Octubre 1 de 1663,'' *ibid.*, p. 7.

Pecos,[77] the *doctrina* at that time administered by Father Posadas. At an unseasonable hour that night, while Father Posadas was walking up and down the corridor reciting the rosary, Peñalosa entered. Indulging in the most undignified personalities, Peñalosa charged Father Posadas with having tried to instigate a revolt in the province, and chided him for not having, from the standpoint of his own interest, tried to serve the governor's pleasure, "instead of dealing with attachments by the inquisition."[78] Father Posadas was then placed under arrest by Peñalosa and carried to Santa Fe. There the priest was locked up in one of the rooms of the governor's palace, the window was closed with adobe and pieces of timber, guards were placed outside the room, and two pieces of artillery were loaded and trained on the principal door of the hall leading to the plaza.[79] In this way did Peñalosa safeguard against any possible demonstration.

The arrest of the father *comisario* created consternation among both laymen and ecclesiastics, who alike pronounced it an unprecedented act. At Pecos, Father Nicolás Enríquez ordered that the sacrament should be consumed forthwith, for he feared

[77] About eighteen miles southeast of Santa Fe. Note by Hodge, in Benavides, *Memorial of 1630* (Ayer tr.), 278.

[78] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 9.

[79] "Carta de Fray Antonio de Ybargaray al Tribunal, Galistéo, Octubre 1 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 7; "Carta de Fray Nicolas Henriquez a Fray Antonio de Ybargaray, Santa Fé, Octubre 1 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 8; "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 9; "Declaracion de Fray Thomas de Alvarado, convento de San Diego de las Jemez," *ibid.*, p. 10; "Declaracion de Andres Lopez Zambrano, Santo Domingo, Febrero 20 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 10; "Declaracion de Fray Nicolas Enriquez, Mayo 1664, Santa Fé," *ibid.*, p. 12; "Declaracion de Fray Gabriel de Torija, Santo Domingo, Junio 3 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 15.

When Father Posadas protested against this outrage, Peñalosa is reported to have said that, being governor and captain-general, he was superior to the office of the tribunal; that the only court which he had to obey was the royal *audiencia*; but that when it sent him orders he would do what seemed good to him, for he was superior in all things. At the same time Peñalosa said: "They murmur against me because I have my lady friend in a house; this is true, and I brought her here. She has a seat in the church in the most important and conspicuous place of all. She is the mother of my daughter and is my friend, and well deserves to be put in a guilded tabernacle of crystal. . . In my country (Peru) I was a cleric, a Father, and I married when I was ordained as subdeacon, and I sang and intoned nicely a *gloria*, a credo, and a prefacio" (that part of the mass which precedes the canon). "Deposicion de Teresa Aguilera Roche, muger de Mendizabal, Octubre 5, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 4.

some forward or contemptuous act from Peñalosa, who had already threatened to kill him.[80] At Santa Fe, the *guardian* closed the church, ordered the sacrament consumed, called upon the other churches throughout the province to do likewise, and expressed a determination to retaliate with an interdict.[81] The whole proceeding caused "great confusion and scandal among both Spaniards and natives, and if the situation had endured much longer most of the people would have gone from the *villa* to the mountains, because the affair was a thing never before seen nor heard of in the kingdom."[82]

Soon after the imprisonment of Father Posadas, Peñalosa was approached by two religious, who came to ask that the father *comisario* be released; the governor replied that he was going to send him to his superiors "as a covetous person and a disturber of the peace."[83] Later, while talking with other religious and some laymen, Peñalosa caused it to be understood that he was "weighed down, perplexed, and exhausted" on account of having arrested Father Posadas. The following day, October 7, 1663, after a long conference in the room in which Father Posadas was a prisoner, the seven religious present agreed with Peñalosa that they should take an oath of secrecy concerning the affair. A statement was then drawn up, sealed, and left with the governor, after which Peñalosa accompanied Father Posadas to the door and set him at liberty.[84]

[80] "Declaracion de Fray Nicolas Enriquez, Mayo 1664, Santa Fé," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 12.

[81] "Carta de Fray Nicolas Henriquez a Fray Antonio de Ybargaray, Santa Fé, Octubre 1, 1663," *ibid.*, p. 8.

[82] "Declaracion de Andres Lopez Zambrano, Febrero 20 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 12.

[83] "Declaracion de Fray Thomas de Alvarado, convento de San Diego de los Jemes, Noviembre 12 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 10.

[84] "Declaracion de Fray Blas de Herrera del convento de Hemes, Julio 12 de 1663," *ibid.*, p. 9; "Peticion é informe de Posadas al Gobernador Juan de Miranda, 1664," *ibid.*, p. 20. The arrest of Father Posadas is mentioned in the autobiographical sketch of Peñalosa published by Margry and Shea. There it is stated that: "The commissary-general of the Inquisition assumed a boundless authority and wished to dispose sovereignly of everything; so that, to check his tyrannical and extravagant enterprise, he (Peñalosa) was compelled to arrest him as a prisoner for a week in a chamber of the palace, after which he set him at liberty, in the hope that he would be more moderate in the future." "Notice sur le Comte de Peñalosa," in Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français*, 3: 42; English translation in Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 11. See also Houck, *History of Missouri*, 1: 140.

Despite the desire and efforts of Peñalosa to hush up the matter of the arrest of Father Posadas, the news in due time reached the tribunal of the inquisition in Mexico City. On February 7, 1664, formal recommendations were made to that body by the *fiscal*, Ruíz de Zepeda, calling for the arrest of Peñalosa, the attachment of his property, and the sale of a sufficient part of it to pay the guards who should bring him a prisoner to the capital, it being held that "any less a demonstration would not be fitting retribution for such unmeasured impudence." At the same time the *fiscal* introduced *autos* against Fathers Nicolás de Freytas and Miguel de Guebara.[85]

In the meantime Peñalosa had apparently seen the handwriting on the wall. About the end of February, or the beginning of March, 1664, he left New Mexico. With him in his carriage rode his concubine, who had lived in the palace with him; before them Peñalosa caused the royal standard to be carried unfurled. Pains were taken, however, to avoid passing through the town of Santo Domingo, where Father Posadas was at the time.[86]

In his autobiographical sketch it appears that Peñalosa "returned to Mexico by the ordinary route of Parral, where he spent three and a half months."[87] As six months was the ordinary time required for a carriage journey from Santa Fe to Mexico City, Peñalosa must have tarried elsewhere en route, for it was not until on May 17, 1665, that he was delivered a prisoner to the tribunal of the inquisition.[88] A month later, on June 16, formal complaint was made against him as follows:

I denounce and bring criminal complaint against Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa Briceño, who resides in this city, and I say that . . . he has committed very serious crimes, both as usurper of the jurisdiction of this holy office, and in having obliged certain witnesses who had been examined in matters and cases concerning the faith to reveal to him what they had testified before the *comisario*; he has also impeded the proper use

[85] "Requerimiento de Ruiz de Zepeda al Tribunal, México, Febrero 7 de 1664," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 9.

[86] "Carta de Fray Alonzo de Posadas al Tribunal, Enero 3 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 9; "Declaracion de Andres Lopez Zambrano, Santo Domingo, Febrero 20 de 1664," *ibid.*, p. 10.

[87] "Notice sur le Comte de Peñalosa," in Margry, *Découvertes et établissements des Français*, 3: 42; Shea, *Expedition of Don Diego Dionisio de Peñalosa from Santa Fe to the river Mischipi and Quivira in 1662*, 11.

[88] "Auto de racion, México Junio 8 de 1665," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 22.

and exercise of the jurisdiction of the court of the inquisition by formally opposing the bull *Si de protegendis*; and because he tried to serve as an auxiliary in cases before the inquisition, he is suspected of infidelity; he has also said certain things which are very near being proof of the error of infidelity; he has also been a petulant and proud traducer of the tribunal and of its ministers.[89]

The same day, the tribunal demanded that he be incarcerated in the secret prisons, that his possessions be attached, and that a case in matters of faith be prosecuted against him.[90]

Peñalosa's trial began with the first hearing on June 25, 1665, and on February 3, 1668, formal sentence was passed upon him. In the course of the trial many crimes other than those already referred to were charged against him. Among these were rape, incest, robbery, and the enslavement of Indian girls.[91] Against all these charges Peñalosa defended himself ably. He justified his appointment of *encomenderos* to take the place of those whose property had been attached by the inquisition on the ground that the *encomiendas* were the patrimony of the king and that a specific *cédula*, issued by Viceroy Escalona, commanded that there should always be exactly thirty-five *encomenderos*.[92] Referring to the ceremony in the church at Santa Fe prior to his departure for Moqui in March, 1662, Peñalosa said that it was for the purpose "of asking his Divine Majesty for the success of the journey . . . a journey in defense of the Faith, and to remove the abuses which had been growing up ever since the time of the government of Don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, namely, the non-attendance of the natives at the teaching of the doctrine and upon the services of the religious."[93]

[89] "Auto de acusacion. Presentado Junio 16 de 1665," *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 1.

[90] "Auto de prision de Peñalosa, Junio 16 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 22.

[91] "Audiencia del 3 de Julio de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 25. "The defendant violated a certain person, having previously had illicit relations with her two sisters whom he also made pregnant; which shows how little concern he had for affinities. . ." It was charged that the silver in Sonora which he stole from Mendizábal weighed "three hundred and ninety-one and one half marks." The defendant "boasted of his sensualities, both of ravishment and incest, and told how he had made certain persons pregnant under the promise that he would assist them." *Ibid.* As for the kidnapping of the Indian girls, Peñalosa said that it was "in order to do them good . . . for they were only children." "Audiencia de 10 de Diciembre 1665," *ibid.*, p. 28.

[92] "Primera audiencia, Junio 25 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 22.

[93] "Audiencia del 3 de Julio de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 23.

Discussing the arrest of Father Posadas, Peñalosa, at the hearing of December 4, 1665, "said that he is such a great sinner, and that he was so passionate and so blind that, without contemplating anything but the injury of the father *custodio*, he resolved to exile him from the province"; that he had even taken steps to do so, but desisted because of the disturbance created and because Posadas was *comisario* of the inquisition; that by reading certain chapters in the *Politica Indiana* of Solórzano[94] he had been persuaded that he could exile the *comisario*; and that, having discussed this matter with Father Nicolás de Freytas, the latter had assured him that he had legal authority to do so.[95]

Complaining that he had been "governor and captain-general of fifty men belonging to the off-scourings of the earth—mestizos, mulattoes, and foreigners," Peñalosa, in behalf of his defense, made a statement of his alleged services while governor. He enumerated the gifts which he claimed to have made to the churches of New Mexico; he cited instances where he had punished an Indian dogmatist and a slayer of one of the missionaries; he claimed to have visited the forty-two towns in the province "to admonish and command the Indians to attend frequently upon the teachings of the doctrine and divine worship." He had caused the Taos Indians, "who had been in revolt for twenty-two years, and who were living as infidels in El Cuartelejo,[96] on the Quivira frontier," two hundred leagues beyond New Mexico,[97] to return; he had reduced to peace two infidel nations, the Cruzados and the Coninas, settling them in two large towns in the province of Moqui; he had also, by his example, "made a beginning of the devout practice of kissing not only the robes of the priests, but their hands as well, a thing which witless people disdained to do."[98]

[94] Juan de Solórzano Pereira, *Politica Indiana* (Madrid, 1629-1639, 1776).

[95] "Primera audiencia, Junio 25 de 1665," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 22; "Audiencia de Diciembre 4 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 27; "Audiencia de 19 de Diciembre 1665," *ibid.*, p. 27.

[96] The Taos Indians were brought back by Juan de Archuleta, leader of twenty Spaniards. While living at El Cuartelejo the Indians had often gone to Quivira to trade. Escalante, "Carta," in *Land of sunshine*, 12: 313.

[97] A gross exaggeration. El Cuartelejo, according to Dunn, was doubtless in Scott county, Kansas. William E. Dunn, "Spanish reaction against the French advance toward New Mexico, 1717-1727," in Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 2: 350.

[98] "Apuntamientos favorables de este confesante, contra lo Sozpecha de que esta

Peñalosa claimed also that when he was appointed governor he "was strictly charged to settle the *villa* of Cerralvo,[99] permission for which had already been granted. Many difficulties having arisen, he decided upon his own responsibility to recur to the pacification of Quivira, and attempted to settle a *villa* in the midst of the settled region named Atrisco, this being the best site in all New Mexico. He drew up an order to this effect, and twelve or fifteen persons, who offered to make the settlement, signed it with him on Pedro Valera's farm."[100] As the valley of Atrisco is in the vicinity of modern Albuquerque, it is clear that Peñalosa, at this time, was not referring to the original Quivira of Coronado and Oñate. In this connection it should be remembered that one of the Salinas *pueblos*, lying to the southeast of Santa Fe, was called Gran Quivira.[101]

Finally, after admitting that, together with Father Freytas and Father Guebara, he had intrigued against Father Posadas,[102] Peñalosa besought the tribunal "to look upon him as a man exposed to the greatest misery whom his Divine Majesty has at times permitted to have a great fall in order to make him know in his reform that the remedy is brought about by His powerful hand. The faith of the defendant in the clemency of so holy a tribunal is that he may be granted it, and, being reborn to a new life, may persevere to the end in compliance with the obligations of a reformed Catholic Christian."[103]

This was on June 13, 1666. At the same time Peñalosa asked for a surgeon to examine him and treat him. The next day two *cuartillas* of wine were ordered given him. Nearly twenty months later, on February 3, 1668, formal sentence was passed upon Peñalosa as follows:

We must and do command to be reprimanded severely in the audience chamber of this holy office, him who has been accused and testified against; and we order that today, upon which this

casado," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 28; "Respuesta de Diego de Peñalosa, México, Octubre 22 de 1665," *ibid.*, p. 26.

[99] Cerralvo, in Nuevo Leon, had been founded by Luis de Carabajal in 1583. Bolton, *Spanish exploration in the southwest, 1542-1706*, 283.

[100] "Audiencia de Diciembre 11 de 1665," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 29.

[101] See L. Bradford Prince, *Spanish mission churches of New Mexico* (Cedar Rapids, 1915), 353 ff.

[102] "Declaracion de algunas cosas por Peñalosa," in *Causa contra Penalosa*, p. 30.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

our sentence is pronounced, he shall be brought forth for an *auto de fé* as a penitent present in the body, without girdle or hood, with a wax candle in his hands, and that while he is thus standing this our sentence and his deserts shall be read to him, and he shall then abjure the slight suspicion which is proven against him by the testimony, in which he is found and continues to be slightly suspected. Then shall follow the mass, which shall be said without his humiliating himself, except he do so from the time of the recital of the sanctus until after the most holy sacrament is consumed. During the reprimand there shall be present the persons to be designated; and the priest who shall say the mass shall offer the candle. And we condemn the defendant and fine him in the sum of five hundred *pesos*, which we apply to the chamber of the royal fisc of this holy office. We also deprive him perpetually of the right to hold political or military offices, and we also exile him from all these kingdoms of New Spain and the Windward Islands forever. And we command that this sentence shall be executed within thirty days following after the pronouncement of sentence.[104]

Such was the sentence which exiled Peñalosa from New Spain. Ten years later he was at the court of Louis XIV, where he passed the rest of his life in trying to interest the *grand monarque* in plans for attacking New Spain. In view of his friendly relations with Father Freytas it is not surprising that the latter was given the credit for the fictitious "Relacion," concerning which there has heretofore been so much speculation. Nothing is available that would throw any light upon the later career of Father Freytas or of Father Guebara. In 1665 Father Posadas was still serving as Franciscan *custodio* and as *comisario* of the tribunal of the inquisition in New Mexico. Apparently his relations with the new governor, Juan de Miranda, were altogether cordial.

Charles W. Hackett

University of Texas
Austin, Texas

[104] "Sentencia, Febrero 3 de 1668," in *Causa contra Peñalosa*, p. 32.

THE LAST MEETING OF THE CONFEDERATE CABINET[1]

Post cards may be bought in Danville, Virginia, in Charlotte, North Carolina, in Abbeville, South Carolina, and in Washington, Georgia, all showing a local building as "the house where the last meeting of the confederate cabinet was held." In Fort Mill, South Carolina, ladies' workboxes are shown made from the cedar tree under which this meeting was held, and the place where the tree stood is clearly visible. Each of these spots is cherished with the love of a patriotic people for its landmarks, and the accuracy of the tradition is maintained with partisan fervor.

To the historian it is a curious and interesting study to locate the place where Jefferson Davis and his official advisers held their last formal meeting, and if an abundance of documentary material is a safeguard for accuracy, the conclusion should be definite.

It will be advisable first to state the facts as they are known, then to decide what a cabinet meeting is, and then to try to determine where the last meeting of the confederate cabinet was actually held.

It is well known that it was on Sunday, April 2, 1865, that President Davis, during the first part of the morning service at St. Paul's Episcopal church in Richmond, received a telegram from General Lee "announcing his speedy withdrawal from Petersburg, and the corresponding necessity for evacuating Richmond."[2] A cabinet meeting was at once called at Davis' office on the third floor of the customhouse, and at this meeting there were present all members of the cabinet except George

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Louis, May 9, 1919.

[2] Jefferson Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government* (New York, 1881), 2: 667. Davis had been told the same thing unofficially a half hour earlier by Postmaster-General Reagan. John H. Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war* (New York, 1906), 196.

Davis, attorney-general, who had attended a different church from the one he usually attended and who could not be reached with a message till one o'clock, when the meeting had adjourned.[3]

This meeting, which resolved on the last steps necessary for leaving Richmond, was brief, as the situation was by no means a surprise and many of the archives and much of the property had already been removed.[4] Those present at the meeting, in addition to President Davis, were Judah P. Benjamin, secretary of state; John C. Breckenridge, secretary of war; George A. Trenholm, secretary of the treasury; Stephen R. Mallory, secretary of the navy; and John H. Reagan, postmaster-general.[5]

Such of the archives as had not been sent a few days previously to Charlotte, North Carolina — whither Burton N. Harrison, Davis' private secretary, had conducted Mrs. Davis and members of the families of cabinet officers by a special train leaving Richmond March 31[6] — or such as had not still earlier, on March 28, been sent to Danville, Virginia, and on to Charlotte in the care of William J. Bromwell, clerk in the department of state,[7] were now hurriedly put together and sent to Danville. Government officials, state officials, and a few private citizens left at the same time; the party arrived at Danville at three P.M. on Monday, April 3, having crept along at less than ten miles an hour, expecting capture every moment.[8]

Davis and certain members of his party were entertained by Major W. T. Sutherlin in his handsome home, which has recently been purchased by the city and is now preserved as a meeting place for patriotic societies.[9] A commodious brick

[3] "Letter of George Davis," in *Southern historical society papers*, 5: 124.

[4] Stephen R. Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 99 ff., 239 ff.

[5] The two officers last mentioned had served in their respective positions throughout the existence of the government.

[6] Burton N. Harrison, "The capture of Jefferson Davis," in *Century*, 27 (new series 5): 130.

[7] Walter Montgomery, "What became of the seal of the Confederate States of America," in *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, October 15, 1911.

[8] A. K. Pollock, "President Davis' stay in Danville," in *Danville Register*, May 17, 1914; Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 102 ff. See also Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 675, for statement that he arrived in Danville early in the morning.

[9] Pollock, "President Davis' stay in Danville," in *Danville Register*, May 17, 1914.

house on Wilson street, known as the Benedict house, then vacant, was placed at the disposal of the confederate government by the city council, and the reorganization of the clerical force indicated to the citizens the permanent location of the capital at this place.[10]

On April 4, Davis issued his last official proclamation, stating that the capture of the cities had simplified the military situation and that there was no reason to fear for the final outcome. This proclamation is said to have been written at the Sutherlin home, but Commissioner of the Revenue Joseph B. Anderson, who was then a printer's apprentice, says he was present when the document was written in the office occupied by the *Danville Register*.[11] It was drawn up by Benjamin and signed by Davis the same day in the Sutherlin home on a small table still preserved.[12] It was printed as a broadside and also issued as an "extra" the next day by the *Danville Register*, and was reprinted in the *New York Herald* of April 15, 1865—the same issue which carried the news of Lincoln's assassination. A local writer says that the last full meeting of the cabinet was held "in one of the sitting rooms of the Sutherlin mansion," but Secretary Breckinridge was not present during any of the stay in Danville. He had left Richmond on horseback at the time the presidential special left, but he did not join the Davis party till it reached Greensboro.[13]

To Danville, this new capital of the dying confederacy, John E. Wise, on the evening of April 8,[14] brought the report that Lee

[10] Harrison, "The capture of Jefferson Davis," in *Century*, 27: 131; but as to the intention of permanency see Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 676.

[11] Letter of A. H. Taylor, editor of the *Danville Register*, to the author, April 5, 1919.

[12] Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 677; also B. Boisseau Bobbitt, "Last hours of the confederacy," reprinted in *Danville Register*, April 13, 1919.

[13] Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 105; Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 679. But Clark says that Breckinridge arrived from Danville a few days afterward. Captain M. H. Clark, "Departure of President Davis and cabinet from Richmond, Virginia," in *Confederate soldier in the civil war*, 318. A writer in the *Confederate veteran*, August, 1911, makes up a "full cabinet" by naming two persons who were not cabinet members and giving a third name incorrectly.

[14] John S. Wise, *The end of an era* (Boston, 1899), 442.

was about to surrender; and, in the afternoon of April 10,[15] official news of the capitulation. On the same evening, about ten P.M., Davis and the cabinet left Danville, as it was impossible to defend this city after Lee's surrender.[16]

Davis and his cabinet, except Breckinridge, arrived at Greensboro in the morning of April 11, having passed over one railroad bridge a few minutes before it was destroyed by federal raiders. On the same day Davis summoned General Johnston to meet him, and on the next day, April 12,[17] a cabinet meeting was held at eight o'clock in the evening on the second floor of the house where Davis was entertained. All the members of the cabinet were present except Trenholm, who was ill; Breckinridge, who had not yet arrived; and possibly George Davis.[18] There were also present Generals Johnston and Beauregard. The next day, April 13, another meeting was held at which Secretary Breckinridge was present, having arrived late on the previous evening with the details and the terms of Lee's surrender. Trenholm was still sick and was not present at this meeting, which was held at ten o'clock in the morning.[19] At one of these two meetings, which Mallory's memory condenses into one, occurred the well-known scene in which General Johnston expressed his view of the situation, summing it up in one sentence: "Since Lee's surrender they regard the war as at an end." This opinion was concurred in fully by General Beauregard and apparently by members of the cabinet[20] who had talked with Johnston since their arrival at Greensboro. At the second and last meeting it was decided that it was useless for Davis, as head of the civil government, to attempt to treat for peace, but that

[15] Several writers, including Pierce Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin* (Philadelphia, [1907]), 361, give this date as April 9. In the opinion of the present writer, the news did not reach Davis until the next day.

[16] Alfred Roman, *The military operations of General Beauregard in the war between the states, 1861-1865; including a brief personal sketch and a narrative of his services in the war with Mexico, 1846-1848* (New York, 1884), 2: 389.

[17] Mallory's date, April 15, given in "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 240, is clearly incorrect. Mallory, writing in prison with no data except his memory, is also incorrect in other details.

[18] *Ibid.*; Roman, *Military operations of General Beauregard in the war between the states*, 2: 394.

[19] Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 199.

[20] Except Benjamin. See Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 399 ff.

Johnston should make the preliminary overtures to Sherman. "A letter dictated by Mr. Davis, written by Mr. Mallory, and signed by General Johnston, was handed to the latter, with authority to forward it to General Sherman."[21] This military conference appears to have been the only official business transacted at Greensboro, though Johnston, in a letter to Beauregard dated March 30, 1868, says that this conference on the morning of April 13 was "an hour or two after the meeting of his cabinet."[22]

Davis and his party left Greensboro on the afternoon of April 14, and seem to have felt that the people of Greensboro, who Burton Harrison says "had not been zealous supporters of the Confederate Government," had not been hospitable in their entertainment.[23] This judgment was based partly on their general air of hostility, partly on the fact that all the party except Davis and Trenholm were lodged in the box cars in which they arrived. Davis was entertained by Colonel John Taylor Wood, just removed from Richmond, but he and his family were boarding and his landlord seemed afraid to allow Davis to stay in his house, lest it be burned afterwards by the "Federals." Trenholm, who was ill, was entertained at the house of ex-Governor Morehead.[24]

On the other hand, General Beauregard, who had spoken of his delightful entertainment by the people of the city and especially Governor Morehead a few weeks before this, on this trip also maintained his headquarters in a box car to be ready for moving at any emergency.[25] He has given impressive account of his entering the president's car on his arrival from Danville

21 Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 395; Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 242.

22 Roman, *Military operations of General Beauregard in the war between the states*, 2: 664.

23 Harrison, "The capture of Jefferson Davis," in *Century*, 27: 132; Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 107.

24 *Ibid.* But Governor Morehead's daughter says (*Charlotte Observer*, January, 1901) that it was Memminger, who was Trenholm's predecessor as secretary of the treasury, and also that Davis refused the invitation of her father "lest the Federal troops should burn the house that sheltered him for one night." As this account, however, goes on to say that President and Mrs. Davis (who was in Charlotte at that time) remained in their car, and also that Vice-President Stephens (who was at his home in Crawfordsville, Georgia, from February 10 to May 11) was at the Morehead home, it is evident that personal recollections at a late date can not be trusted.

25 Roman, *Military operations of General Beauregard in the war between the states*, 2: 387.

and being "struck by the helpless appearance of the gentlemen there."

Harrison gives a humorous account of his struggle to get an ambulance for Benjamin, whose "figure was not well adapted for horseback riding." Finally, on the afternoon of April 14, the party started south for Charlotte with Benjamin, George Davis, Trenholm, and a few others in ambulances, the others, including President Davis, on horseback.[26] The first night was spent at a farmhouse, a few miles from Greensboro; the next, April 15, at Lexington, from which place Breckinridge and Reagan returned to go to a council with Sherman; April 16 at Salisbury; and April 17 at Concord. The next day the party entered Charlotte. Such is the account of Burton N. Harrison, Davis' private secretary. Mallory's account, written in 1865 while he was in prison in Fort Lafayette, New York harbor, and published in 1901 by his daughter,[27] says the party left Greensboro on April 16 and stopped in Lexington the first night. But one who reads Harrison's descriptions of the muddy roads and the struggles of the ambulances with Secretary Benjamin, Adjutant-General Cooper, and other fat men will easily allow more than one afternoon for the first thirty-four miles.

A curious instance of the difficulties met by the historian occurs in connection with this journey. Mallory mentions the party as spending the night of April 16 at Lexington at the home of Judge Barringer, and this error is repeated by Dodd, in his life of Jefferson Davis.[28] As a matter of fact, Judge Barringer lived at Concord and the Davis party stayed at his home and that of Mr. Allison on the night of April 17. But, to add to the difficulty, Mr. Paul B. Barringer, of the University of Virginia, has in his possession the illuminated copy of *Rasselas*— given him on his eighth birthday a few months before this— which, at his aunt's suggestion, he took to the visitors to have them write their names in it. It has on a fly leaf the autographs of Davis, Mallory, and others of the party dated "*Apr. 19, '65*"

[26] Benjamin could ride when necessary, and he did ride across South Carolina from Charlotte to Abbeville with his short legs sticking straight out but still preserving his appearance of being well-dressed — even if coat and trousers were made of an old army shawl. Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 362.

[27] Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 242.

[28] William E. Dodd, *Jefferson Davis* (Philadelphia, 1907), 358.

in the original writing of each man. The only explanation is that in the confusion of the times Davis and the others mistook the calendar.

At Charlotte Davis and his party remained from April 18 to April 26. About two days after the party reached Charlotte, they were rejoined by Breckinridge and Reagan, and for a time, till Breckinridge returned to Johnston's army, the full cabinet was together. Here were several public establishments of the confederate government, including a "navy yard," which deserves separate treatment. Just as Davis reached Charlotte he was notified by a telegram from Breckinridge, who was with Johnston in his conference with Sherman, of Lincoln's assassination.

While the party was in Charlotte official meetings were held in the directors' room of Dewey's branch of the bank of North Carolina, where stands now the *Observer* building.[29] Trenholm was still sick at the time of his arrival in Charlotte and was at once taken to the home of William Phifer, and it was to his sick room that the other members of the cabinet came for the last meeting held here.

Mallory says: "While here [evidently April 23] Mr. Davis received the propositions agreed upon between Johnston and Sherman for peace, submitted them to his cabinet, and called upon the members present for written opinions upon the subject. These were called for about ten o'clock in the evening, when the terms were received, and the cabinet met him at ten the next morning, all present except Mr. Breckinridge, who had approved them and who was with Johnston, and Mr. Trenholm, who was sick in a private house in Charlotte. No comparison or interchange of opinion had been made, and yet their views were nearly identical as to the condition of the country, the character of the terms, and the policy of accepting them; and Mr. Trenholm, when called upon, concurred in the views of his colleagues. They were returned to Johnston approved."[30] This was April 24.[31] On

[29] Mrs. J. A. Fore, "Cabinet meeting held here," in *Charlotte Observer*, April 26, 1915.

[30] Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 244; Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 202 ff.

[31] Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 688.

the same day Sherman gave notice that the terms proposed were not approved by the Washington government and that the armistice would be terminated in forty-eight hours. This was communicated to Davis and a meeting was held in Trenholm's room at the Phifer residence. At this meeting, Davis says, instructions were given that Johnston "should retire with his cavalry, and as many infantry as could be mounted on draught horses," and the rest of the infantry should be disbanded to meet at an appointed rendezvous.[32] This order, as is well known, was not carried out, and Johnston's surrender followed.[33] Davis' friends were advising him to escape from the country and it may be presumed that at this meeting it was determined to flee, at least farther south. Davis, however, was by nature sanguine — or stubborn — and as proffers of help came to him the idea came back again of getting together troops and trying once more.

Immediately after the armistice had expired, probably the afternoon of April 26, Davis and four, possibly five, of his cabinet rode horseback to the residence of A. B. Springs, three miles from the North Carolina line and three miles from Fort Mill, South Carolina. Attorney-General Davis had left the party at Charlotte to take charge of his family and did not rejoin the cabinet.[34] Trenholm remained in his sick room for several days after the party left Charlotte.[35] Davis and part of his company stayed two or three days at Springs' house; the others rode into Fort Mill and stayed at the home of William E. White. Here

[32] Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 689.

[33] Joseph E. Johnston, *Johnston's narrative of military operations, directed, during the late war between the states* (New York, 1874), 411.

[34] Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 208.

[35] Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government*, 2: 689. Reagan and Clark say that Trenholm went about twenty miles with Davis, possibly to Fort Mill, and was compelled by his physical condition to turn back. Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 209; Clark, "Departure of President Davis and cabinet from Richmond, Virginia," in *Confederate soldier in the civil war*, 318 ff. Others make reference to the fact that Trenholm went as far as "the Catawba River." Fort Mill is two miles from the old Nation Road ferry over the Catawba. Colonel Leroy Springs is certain that one member of the cabinet resigned and turned back from Fort Mill. Miss Cordelia White Phifer, who is a daughter of the Mr. Phifer in Charlotte and a granddaughter of the Mr. White in Fort Mill, says that Trenholm did go to Fort Mill and on to Winnsboro and thence home, but her memory is that it was later. Letter of Miss Phifer to the author, April 29, 1919.

Davis came on the morning of April 29.[36] Springs had strongly advised the cabinet to separate to avoid capture. A meeting was held in White's yard under the cedar tree of the Fort Mill tradition. Doubtless Davis again agreed with what was left of his cabinet that only flight was possible, and the party moved on again, spending the next night, April 29, in Yorkville. Late the next day, the party left Yorkville and spent the night at Union. The night of May 1 was spent at Cokesbury. Leaving there at two o'clock in the morning, the small party arrived at Abbeville in the early forenoon of May 2. Davis was entertained at the home of his personal friend, Major Armistead Burt, the other four members of the cabinet at the home of Colonel T. C. Perrin. About four o'clock in the afternoon, on hearing the news that a body of federal cavalry was approaching the town, a conference was held at Major Burt's house. At this meeting there were present Davis, Secretary Breckinridge, and General Bragg.[37] To this meeting, called "a council of war" by Davis, were called the five brigade commanders, Ferguson, Dibrell, Vaughan, Basil Duke, and W. C. P. Breckinridge. "No one else was present."[38]

Davis was again optimistic of success, but each member of his council expressed the idea that any further prolongation of the conflict was impossible. One of the officers — local tradition says it was Basil Duke — when finally asked by Davis if the soldiers would fight said, "Mr. Davis, they will risk anything for you." With some asperity Davis said, "I did not ask that, will they fight for the Confederacy?" Thus pressed Duke said, "Mr. Davis, they think the war is over." Various accounts of Davis' actions are given, but all agree that he seemed to collapse at this statement. Local tradition, again, says that Burt took him by the arm to assist him to his room. General Duke, who says ex-

[36] These dates are calculated as nearly as possible from Mallory, "Last days of the confederate government," in *McClure's magazine*, 16: 246; letters from Colonel Leroy Springs, Lancaster, South Carolina, and from Mrs. J. M. Odell, Concord, North Carolina; as well as from the local traditions of Fort Mill.

[37] Walter Miller, "Last meeting of the confederate cabinet," in *Blue and gray*, June, 1894; manuscript of Miss Hannah C. Perrin and letter of Mrs. George White, Sr. (daughters of Colonel Perrin), April 5, 1919; W. C. Benet, "Last meeting of the confederate cabinet," in *Abbeville Press and Banner*, February 21, 1917.

[38] Basil W. Duke, "Last days of the confederacy," in *Battles and leaders of the civil war* (New York, 1894), 5: 704, and Duke, *Morgan's cavalry* (New York, 1906), 438.

pressly that there was no one present except the men above mentioned, says it was Breckinridge who took his arm.

A daughter of Colonel Perrin, Miss Hannah C. Perrin, who was at that time a young girl, writes: "After the last soldier left (many of the soldiers were paid off here), father went into the library, where Mr. Benjamin was burning official papers. The latter pointed to the seal, which was lying on the table, and said he did not know what to do with it, as he could not burn it, and yet he was unwilling for the Federals to get it. Father suggested that he throw it into the Savannah, which he had to cross, and he said he would do it."[39] This, of course, was not the official seal, which reached Richmond just before the evacuation, was stored at Charlotte, North Carolina, for some time after the war, and after a strange adventure came into the hands of the Confederate museum at Richmond, where it is now.[40] Those who have seen the seal can hardly imagine its being carried on horseback for a week.

After using part of the coin belonging to the confederacy to pay off to a certain extent the soldiers, variously estimated at from 3,000 to 8,000, the party moved on to Washington, Georgia. Leaving Abbeville about eleven P.M., by hard riding they reached Washington by ten A.M. the next day, May 3, "crossing the Savannah River at Fort Charlotte Plantation, below Vienna on a pontoon bridge."[41] From this point the party began to break up. Breckinridge remained with the cavalry at the crossing of the Savannah, came to Washington a few hours after Davis left, and afterwards escaped to Florida and Cuba. Benjamin bade good-by to the party a few hours later while they were breakfasting a short distance from Washington. He also escaped through Florida to the Bahamas and then to England.[42] The next day after reaching Washington, Mallory handed in his resignation as secretary of the navy and that afternoon pro-

[39] Miller, "Last meeting of the confederate cabinet," in *Blue and gray*, June, 1894.

[40] Gaillard Hunt, quoted in Clark, "Great seal of the Confederate States," in *Confederate veteran*, August, 1912; also Montgomery, "What became of the seal of the Confederate States of America," in *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, October 15, 1911.

[41] Miller, "Last meeting of the confederate cabinet," in *Blue and Gray*, June, 1894.

[42] Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 362 ff.

ceeded to his home in La Grange, Georgia. Reagan had been appointed secretary of the treasury after Trenholm's resignation,[43] and therefore he, in his two offices of postmaster-general and secretary of the treasury, constituted the "cabinet" at the meeting held the next morning, May 4, in the old bank building. This building has been torn down, but a room in the new courthouse building on the exact spot where this meeting was held is set aside as a room for "The Last Cabinet Meeting Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy."[44]

Davis was again optimistic in his hopes of joining Kirby, Smith, Price, and others, and of continuing the struggle.[45] At this meeting, besides Davis and Reagan, there were present several officers. Again it was agreed that the struggle was useless, as it had been agreed at Greensboro, at Charlotte, at Fort Mill, and at Abbeville, and as doubtless it had been talked over in countless conversations, or "cabinet meetings," as the small official party rode on horseback across South Carolina. On the same afternoon, May 4, Davis rode out of Washington to be followed in a few hours by Reagan. Whether he and Reagan held any further "meetings" in the six days intervening before his capture is not recorded.

Before leaving Washington, probably at this meeting in the old bank building, Davis named Captain M. H. Clark acting treasurer of the Confederate States, and this appointment is the last official document signed by the president of the confederacy. The table on which this document was signed was long preserved by Mrs. M. E. Robertson, who entertained Davis on this visit.[46]

Such are the known facts in regard to the actions of Davis and his advisers at each of these places. The question which was the last meeting of the cabinet still remains. In other words, what is a cabinet meeting? There is no authority in the consti-

[43] Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 209.

[44] Letter from Mrs. Ruth T. Irvine, Washington, Georgia, to the author, April 8, 1919.

[45] Mrs. M. M. Robertson, "Closing days of the confederacy," manuscript in United Daughters of the Confederacy room, Washington, Georgia.

[46] *Ibid.*; Clark, "Great seal of the Confederate States," in *Confederate veteran*, August, 1912, p. 320.

tution of the United States or in that of the Confederate States, which in this section is identical, for a meeting of the cabinet. It is well known that at first Washington asked for opinions of each member separately. The first cabinet meeting seems to have been held April 11, 1791, without the president but with the vice-president.[47] Meetings with the president and all the cabinet, including the attorney-general, were held in 1792, possibly in 1791, and thenceforth regularly.[48] Newspapers of a few months since carried an item stating that a cabinet meeting was held at Washington without president, vice-president, or secretary of state. On the other hand, there is the fact that the president is the executive and may not be guided by the advice of the cabinet; and there is the well-known story, probably apocryphal, of Lincoln's announcing his dissent from the unanimous opinion of the cabinet in the words, "Seven nays, and one aye; the ayes have it." Clearly a cabinet meeting may consist of all or part of the cabinet, with or without the president, and is a cabinet meeting in virtue of its subject of discussion rather than of its form. It may have outside persons to give advice; as one instance of countless cases, the same *New York Herald* which carried news of Lincoln's assassination and of Davis' Danville proclamation mentioned a cabinet meeting just before Lincoln's assassination at which General Grant was present. It is difficult, then, to tell when the president talks matters over personally with members of his cabinet and when he has a formal meeting. There is no sure test.

As to the meeting of Davis' cabinet, clearly a real cabinet meeting was held in Richmond on that famous Sunday, a meeting with one member absent. And if the fall of Richmond was the fall of the confederacy, then this meeting was the last. But the confederate government considered itself as fully organized at Danville, and certainly held formal meetings of the cabinet, though again one member was absent. If the last appeal to the people by proclamation marked the end, then the meeting in the Sutherlin home at Danville was the last. At least it may be said

[47] Mary L. Hinsdale, *History of the president's cabinet* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1911), 12; Henry B. Larned, *The president's cabinet* (New Haven, 1912), 124.

[48] *Writings of Thomas Jefferson: being his autobiography, correspondence, reports, messages, addresses, and other writings, official and private* (New York, 1861), 1: 189; Hinsdale, *History of the president's cabinet*, 13.

that Danville was the last capital with organized clerical forces.

Reagan and General Johnston describe a cabinet meeting at Greensboro,[49] giving the opinions of each member, and clearly prove that a formal meeting was held, again with one member absent. It is true that the military conference overshadowed the cabinet meeting, and so far as the writer knows, Greensboro has no post cards of a "last meeting." As a matter of fact, there was nothing in any sense final here except the realization that Johnston could not hold out any longer.

It also is clear that formal meetings of the cabinet were held in Charlotte, with written opinions from cabinet members, as well as open discussion. It is also perfectly sure that the last full meeting of the cabinet was held here, April 26. It may also be noted that this was the first meeting with full attendance since before April 2. The members at this meeting undoubtedly spoke as the representatives of a government; as to those coming afterward, opinions must vary whether they were government meetings or the personal conferences of fleeing individuals. Davis considered himself a president with a government until after he left Washington, Georgia. Though at various times his followers convinced him that all was over, his confident nature returned to its conviction that he was still the head of a government. If his judgment is accepted, there were cabinet meetings at least up to May 4 at Washington, possibly later. As to the facts, Davis and a small body of men were fleeing on horseback from pursuing forces; now they were all together and planning for better things, now they were scattered in the woods to prevent capture. Why not "cabinet meetings" at Yorkville, Union, Cokesbury, or even at the lunch time which Reagan describes on the banks of the Broad river?[50]

Fort Mill also claims on the recollection of its older citizens to have had the last meeting, and avers "that from here the cabinet separated," but if a formal meeting it certainly was not a full meeting. George Davis was absent and also Trenholm, unless we accept Reagan's statement that Trenholm rode this far and then returned sick to Charlotte.

What can be said of Abbeville, where even the seal was dis-

[49] Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 200.
[50] *Ibid.*, 210.

posed of? In the first place this is the only town mentioned where it is known there was no cabinet meeting according to all official statements. What Davis called a "council of war"[51] was held. By General Duke's express testimony, there was only one cabinet officer present, Breckinridge, and he not as a cabinet officer but as a general of the army. Breckinridge and Bragg said absolutely nothing; the council of the five brigade commanders decided the military situation. Neither Davis nor any member of the civil government alludes to any civil or government action. The reason for paying off soldiers and disposing of supplies was that the treasure had been sent here by rail, but the fleeing officers of the government were to leave the railroad here and federal troops were expected at any moment.

As to Washington, Georgia, did Davis and Reagan, in his dual capacity, hold a formal meeting? Mrs. Robertson, writing soon after the events, says there were present six officers whom she names "and many other distinguished officers." Such a conference can hardly be called a "cabinet meeting," but Reagan[52] speaks of it as a "consultation with the cabinet."

Was there, then, a "last meeting"? Probably not, as a conscious, definite ending of things. By degrees the cabinet grew smaller, pressing exigencies of personal safety took the place of public plans, and gradually meetings ceased. If a definition is laid down that a formal meeting of the civil officers of the executive departments to discuss civil matters is a "cabinet meeting," then probably the last purely formal cabinet meeting of the confederacy was held at Charlotte, North Carolina, April 26, 1865, in the upstairs west room of the residence of William Phifer.[53]

James Elliott Walmsley
Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina

[51] Duke, "Last days of the confederacy," in *Battles and leaders of the civil war*, 4: 714.

[52] Reagan, *Memoirs, with special reference to secession and the civil war*, 216.

[53] The local data for this study was secured by the assistance of Miss Susan B. Harrison, house regent of the Confederate museum, Richmond, Virginia; Mrs. W. P. Robinson, Danville, Virginia; Mrs. J. M. Odell, Concord, North Carolina; Mrs. J. A. Fore, Charlotte, North Carolina (who has shown genuine historical spirit in her studies of this question); Mr. Paul B. Barringer, Charlottesville, Virginia; Mrs. Ruth T. Irvin, Washington, Georgia; and Mr. J. W. Thomson, Winthrop college, who has supplied the local data for the events at Abbeville.

THE KHAKI JOURNALISTS, 1917-1919

The greatest initial task of America's participation in the world war was to get the many tongues of the nation to speak the same language of loyalty and patriotism. A few critical months passed after the resolution of April 6, 1917, before it became indisputably clear that the war was the people's war as well as the government's war. However important it may have been to arouse the civilian population to an understanding of the nation's peril, immediate and unerring results were required in dealing with the great conscript and volunteer armies. These huge aggregations of men accurately reflected the diversified population from which they sprang, with its differences of nationality, education, patriotism, pacifism, and amenability to discipline. Yet these men were the raw material from which armies must quickly be manufactured to meet the challenge of the German kaiser. Under the American democratic system these men of many traditions and multifarious training must be taught, within a short space of time, to divest themselves of their peace-time ideas of individual liberty and to grasp the indispensable military conceptions of obedience and *esprit de corps.*

For the accomplishment of these objects, probably the most powerful single factor was an agency that was unthought of when the conscription law was passed by congress — the soldier press. A free press has always been the possession of a free people; and it is not surprising that a soldier press should have been the product of our democratic armies. Beginning with September, 1917, the camps and cantonments in the United States gave birth to more than sixty full-fledged newspapers; the American expeditionary forces overseas established a score or more journals; and after the armistice was signed, newspapers began to appear in the hospitals at home and abroad wherever soldiers were convalescing from injuries. The soldier press probably rendered its greatest service in the early months of the war when the men, fresh from civilian occupations, were undergoing the difficult processes of adjustment and assimila-

tion attendant on the transition to military life. There were only two large camps in the United States in which the soldiers did not have their own organs, and in some camps two or even more papers were published.

It would be difficult to say where the idea of establishing camp newspapers originated, for it seemed to occur spontaneously to people in several parts of the country. In the earlier wars of the United States such newspapers had been established. As far back as the revolutionary war the soldiers are known to have seized deserted newspaper offices and published army organs as long as the troops remained in the vicinity. One effort was even of a more ambitious character. While the British forces occupied New York and controlled the newspapers printed there, the New Jersey legislature as a war measure promoted the establishment of the *New-Jersey Journal* at Chatham. The patriot army under Washington, not far away, helped its publisher with "Nine Hundred Wt of old Tent Unfitt for service," later with "Eight Hundred Three Quarters & Twelve pound old Tent Cloath," and on other occasions with "Two Bundles Old Tent Rags w^{t} Two Hundred One Quarter" and similar contributions. All these were used for the manufacture of paper, which was very difficult to obtain. In addition, the army actually furnished a large amount of white paper out of its meager stores in order that the soldiers might have a newspaper which gave news of the American side of the struggle.

During the Mexican war army newspapers were also to be found in many of the camps. The army under General Winfield Scott had its own organ known as the *American Flag*; and there were other papers such as the *Sentinel*, published at Tampico; the *American Star*, issued at Jalapa; the *Picket Guard*, published at Saltillo; and the *Eagle*, printed at Vera Cruz. During the civil war newspapers likewise sprang up wherever the armies went; but most of them were short-lived, being printed on presses found in captured southern towns. These newspapers frequently assumed an attitude of criticism and reproof toward superior officers that would not have been tolerated in the late war. For example, the *Federal Knapsack*, issued "at uncertain intervals" by the 125th regiment, Ohio volunteers, printed its third number on March 20, 1863, on an abandoned

newspaper press in Franklin, Tennessee; one barbed paragraph asserted: "If reducing the rank of officers for mis-conduct or ill-management were as frequent an occurrence as promoting them for good luck or bravery, the service would be greatly benefited." In another place the editors took occasion "to suggest the propriety of a strong reserve nearer to our pickets on this side of the river."

In no previous war, however, were military newspapers as systematically established or as widely influential as in the war just closed. Lieutenant L. R. Fairall, who at that time was editor of the *Camp Dodger* of Camp Dodge, Iowa, declared in an article in the *Infantry Journal*: "This war has developed many new things for the army. And when it is all over, military historians will find that one of the most powerful forces in developing the much-boasted morale of our Yankee army was the soldier press."

The first important step toward the establishment of camp newspapers came through the formation of the *Trench and Camp* chain of weekly newspapers in October, 1917. This far-reaching enterprise was launched by the national war work council of the Y. M. C. A. Mr. George E. Vincent, president of the Rockefeller foundation, had first urged the desirability of such a league of papers upon the war work council; but the difficulties in the way of working out the details of the plan seemed insuperable. Mr. J. S. Bryan, however, editor of the *Richmond News-Leader* (Virginia), who had been working independently on a similar project, was able to come to the assistance of the war work council with concrete proposals. Mr. Bryan's plan was the outcome of consultations with newspaper publishers in cities adjacent to training camps in many sections of the country. As adopted by the war work council, it provided that the Y. M. C. A. should furnish, at its own expense, half the contents of the newspaper in the form of syndicated matrices, from which newspaper press plates could easily be made, and that publishers in nearby cities should set up the other half of the newspaper from "copy" furnished from the local camp and then complete the printing of the edition.

The *Trench and Camp* chain eventually consisted of weekly newspapers in thirty-eight of the great training camps, extend-

ing from coast to coast and from the gulf to the lakes. Many of these papers would have been creditable even to large cities; few of them were distinctly poor. In accordance with Mr. Bryan's plan, one half of each copy of a *Trench and Camp* newspaper was national in scope, its contents applying to all the camps and to military matters in general. This portion was filled with cartoons, editorials, stories, and poems produced by soldiers in the various cantonments, and it also contained special articles on military subjects, social hygiene, lessons in elementary French, and other instructive matter. The other half of the paper was made up of news items and editorials dealing exclusively with the life and activities of the camp in which the edition appeared.

Some of the papers undoubtedly suffered in popularity in the early months of their existence because of the feeling of some soldiers that the papers were being used as "a Y. M. C. A. advertising scheme." Wherever there was any basis for this belief the central directing board in New York acted promptly and eliminated editors who had not caught the vision of broader usefulness which the camp journals were designed to serve. The copies were distributed free of charge. At first it was thought that a circulation of four thousand would fill the need of each camp, and the Y. M. C. A. supplied print paper for that number. When this proved inadequate, the local editors were permitted to solicit sufficient advertising to cover the cost of paper for an enlarged edition. At one time the combined circulation of all the *Trench and Camp* weeklies exceeded 380,000 copies.

The *Trench and Camp* syndicate by no means monopolized the camp publishing field, for there were a score or more of independent journals. The best of these were generally to be found in cantonments where the Y. M. C. A. weeklies had not been established. Although lacking the standardization which came from national supervision, these organs frequently displayed greater individuality and enterprise than the league papers. On the other hand, they were not likely to enjoy as long a life, for when the troops who fathered them departed for France, the papers usually discontinued publication.

One of the strongest of the independent organs was the *Camp Sherman News*, of Camp Sherman, Ohio. The idea of establish-

ing the *Camp Sherman News*, or *Eighty-third Division News* as it was first called, originated with Major General E. F. Glenn, first commandant of the cantonment; and the proprietor of the *Columbus Evening Dispatch* readily agreed to print the paper each week at his own expense. The first issue appeared on November 7, 1917, and the paper enjoyed an uninterrupted existence until it was discontinued on July 31, 1919. It sold at a nominal cost, and at one time attained a circulation of 36,000; it never had any real competitor in the camp. For a short period one of the heavy field artillery companies published a paper called *Shrapnel*, which because of its success grew into a regimental organ known as the *Howitzer*; but whatever future lay before this hopeful project was cut short, after two numbers had been issued, by the rude interruption of a summons to its editors to leave for France.

The most extraordinary venture in camp journalism was undoubtedly the publication of a daily newspaper at Camp Sheridan, Alabama, during the winter and spring of 1917-1918 while the thirty-seventh division was stationed there. This enterprise was unique from every point of view. The paper sought to combine the functions of the usual camp organ with those which an ordinary civilian daily is expected to perform. It was issued seven days a week and received full leased wire reports from two international news syndicates. One of these companies alone furnished from 12,000 to 16,000 words of telegraphic news daily, more than half of which had to be discarded because of the editorial policy to publish only such news as would interest the soldiers. Unlike other camp journals, it was, in the full sense of the term, a soldiers' newspaper. Soldiers gathered and edited the news, they operated the linotype machines, they solicited the advertising, and they managed the circulation. It was the proud boast of the editors of the *Sheridan Reveille*, as the paper was called, that "from the time the news breaks in the camp until the paper is delivered before reveille every morning, no civilian hand touches the copy." The paper was printed on pages of seven columns each, and contained four pages daily with six or eight pages in the Sunday edition.

The first issue appeared on December 5, 1917. As in the case of

every successful soldier publication, the success of the *Sheridan Reveille* was due largely to the fact that experienced newspaper men guided its destinies. Of the editorial staff, Lieutenant H. P. French, the editor-in-chief, had been connected for a long time with the *Washington Post*; Jack Koons, the managing editor, had formerly been an editor of the *Cincinnati Enquirer*; Fred Pletcher, the telegraph editor, had served in a similar capacity with the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*; and the cartoonist, Don Palmer, had as a civilian drawn cartoons for the *Chicago Daily News*.

The trials of the editors in getting out the paper every twenty-four hours in the midst of military duties would read like fiction. The first six weeks' experience inspired the staff to declare editorially: "We are convinced that the organization and production of a newspaper, especially in an army camp, is as delightful and entertaining as selling silk sox or castor oil to a gang of mad, head-hunting African heathens." Obstacles appeared on every hand. The difficulty of getting the papers mailed out of the Montgomery postoffice seemed unusually great for reasons which no one seemed able to fathom. The newspapers of Montgomery sought to discredit the paper and to interfere with its publication because of its attractiveness to local merchants as an advertising medium. Incidentally, the military authorities believed that the men on the staff should occasionally be called upon to perform duties other than those connected with getting out a daily newspaper. Nevertheless, the *Reveille* continued to appear and its success is attested by its wide circulation in the camp and in the home communities from which the soldiers came. After one hundred and forty-two issues, it discontinued publication when preparations were under way to entrain for France, justly proud of its record of being the only daily paper in the world published exclusively by soldiers.

A more modest experiment in daily newspapers, undertaken at the naval training station at Great Lakes, Illinois, survives to the present time. This news medium, which bears the name of the *Great Lakes Bulletin*, contains eight small pages of three columns each; it is published by the bluejackets every day in the week except Sunday, and sells for one cent. Notwithstand-

ing the fact that its circulation during the war exceeded fifteen thousand, it had to apologize to the public because it could not print all the copies that were demanded.

After all, the most extraordinary feature about the camp newspapers was the service they rendered in helping to fashion the best armies in the world out of masses of miscellaneous humanity. By means of the soldier press the interest of the men, from their first arrival in camp, was captured and focused on the life of the division of which they formed a part. They were led to think in terms of their camp just as freshmen in college are taught to regard themselves as part of a larger campus community. The transition from civilian life to military life was rendered easier by means of reasoned articles on the necessity for teamwork and obedience and by editorials on the nature of the issues at stake in the war. The men were made acquainted with the facilities offered by the religious and social welfare agencies operating in and near the cantonment and encouraged to make frequent use of them. The camp journals conducted publicity campaigns for war risk insurance policies and boosted the sales of liberty loan bonds and war saving stamps into the millions. The *Camp Sherman News* reported at the end of one week's campaign that 21,378 of the officers and men out of the 32,844 in camp had applied for military insurance policies averaging $8,565 each.

The camp press also had a large circulation in the home communities of the soldiers. When the project of a soldiers' newspaper was under consideration at Camp McClellan, Alabama, one of the general officers of the camp shrewdly observed: "We need one representative publication under the supervision of the camp to offset the impressions given by 35,000 letters leaving the camp each week uncensored. The people at home reading the newspaper will obtain a true and clear vision of the actual life here." This service the soldier press splendidly performed. The papers always insisted that the soldiers should write to their families, and some even went so far as to suggest each week subjects that the home folks were likely to be interested in, such as: "How much weight are you gaining? Don't you think that regular hours agree with you? How many new friends have you made since coming to camp?" These papers

were largely responsible for the nation-wide crusade, early in the war, for the writing of cheerful letters to soldiers by their civilian friends.

Almost as important was the part that the soldier journalists played in protecting the interests of the men in uniform from the predatory or ill-considered actions of the civilian population round about the training camps. The *Sheridan Reveille* carried through a successful campaign to eliminate the evil of overcharging by taxi drivers. The *Camp Dodger*, *Camp Sherman News*, and many other papers did everything in their power to expose merchants who unfairly raised prices in dealing with soldiers. One heavy black headline read in true metropolitan style: "Banish the burglars, rid the city of these profiteering pirates." The editors published blacklists, warning readers of those business houses which should not be patronized; and a few papers even declined to accept advertisements from firms which would not first guarantee that their merchandise had not been marked up for soldier purchasers. The papers also conducted campaigns to rid the camps of seditious literature and did many other things to safeguard the morals and material comfort of the men in uniform.

Besides news sheets of the kinds that have been described, humorous papers made their appearance in the army camps, most of them short-lived. Pictorial magazines proved more successful. One firm, the Camp publishing company, arranged early in the war for the publication of a series of fortnightly photographic reviews in four southern cantonments, each magazine, however, containing pictures devoted exclusively to soldier activities in the particular camp. The best example of the illustrated magazine was unquestionably the *Great Lakes Recruit*, which is still being published by the bluejackets at the naval training station at Great Lakes, Illinois. This is a monthly magazine of many pages, printed on heavy paper and containing scores of attractive photographs, artistic drawings, and cartoons. It sells for but twenty cents and compares favorably with the best illustrated periodicals known to civilian life.

The soldiers of democracy were not content to leave their newspapers behind them when they entered upon overseas service. At the American embarkation camps, a weekly newspaper

called *Going Over* was distributed free of charge by the international war work council of the Y. M. C. A. When the tide turned and the troops began to return to America, this paper promptly changed its name to *Coming Back.* On board the troopships miniature daily newspapers sprang up as if by magic, containing radio dispatches of the latest military developments in Europe and quips and jests of local import. These sheets seldom lived longer than the duration of the voyage; but occasionally a paper like the *Hatchet,* published on board the *George Washington,* survived a succession of voyages.

Once on the other side, the soldiers managed to keep in touch with the world's events and with each other's doings through the *Stars and Stripes,* the official news organ of the American expeditionary forces and the best known of all soldier newspapers. This paper was printed at the office of the *London Daily Mail*; the first issue appeared on February 8, 1918. It quickly obtained enough advertising to become self-supporting and won a net paid circulation of 200,000, many of the copies going to civilians in America. Single copies sold for fifty centimes. Due to its size, typographical appearance, news service, special departments, and able editorials, the paper gave the impression of a journal of many years' standing. Publication was suspended with the issue of June 13, 1919.

The doughboy, however, was not content with a single newspaper of general circulation. His ingenuity and energy found vent in the establishment of many minor organs published by special units of the overseas army. These papers were usually unpretentious little sheets printed with duplicating machines or on abandoned printing presses, somewhat as in the revolutionary and civil wars. A notice in the *Pauillac Pilot,* issued by the United States naval aviation station at Pauillac, France, declared that that paper was being "turned out on a rheumatic French press, whose rollers have not moved since the memorable August day, four years ago, when its printers left its type cases to shoulder a rifle in defense of France." Of these lesser publications some of the better known were the *Radiator,* published weekly by the American ambulance service; the *Ohio Rainbow Reveille,* gotten out by the 166th infantry (formerly the fourth Ohio national guard); *Plane News,* the official avia-

tion paper; *Gas Attack*, representing the twenty-seventh division; and the *Spiker*, organ of the eighteenth railway engineers. In February of the current year the latest army newspaper made its appearance when the army of occupation in Germany established an official newspaper under the appropriate title of the *Watch on the Rhine*. Next to the *Stars and Stripes*, this was the most pretentious organ published by our men overseas. It was printed by the men of the third division while they were stationed at Andernach, a little German town about ten miles from Coblenz, and sold for fifty pfennigs. A marked characteristic of all the overseas journals was the inexhaustible fund of humor and optimism upon which the editors were constantly able to draw. The severest hardships and the most disagreeable circumstances were treated in their columns as the greatest of larks. Occasionally these drolleries were interrupted with sharp rebukes for politicians at home who were trying to make personal or political capital out of the war's tortuous course.

When President Wilson was informed that the national war work council was contemplating the establishment of a chain of soldier newspapers, he expressed the belief that these journals would have an important influence "in interpreting to the soldiers the hope and enthusiasm of the nation behind them, and interpreting to the nation the fine determination and spirit of our men in arms." There can be no doubt that the khaki journalists fulfilled this mission. And they imposed a heavy debt of gratitude on the historians who at some future time will seek to narrate the story of the part that the armed citizenry played in the winning of the great war.

Arthur Meier Schlesinger

State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE TRANS-MISSISSIPPI NORTHWEST, 1917-1919

The present survey includes the states of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. As no review was prepared in 1918, the period of time here considered is the biennium from October 1, 1917, to October 1, 1919. Although the war has undoubtedly brought about conditions which have limited historical activities and publication, it is to be noted that several new publications have been launched within the period and no historical magazine or series heretofore regularly published has been discontinued.

Progress and Activities of Historical Societies

For the Minnesota historical society the biennium has been a notable one inasmuch as it has witnessed the occupation of the new historical building. The first books were moved into the new quarters on December 11, 1917, and by the following May the society was sufficiently settled to act as host for the Mississippi valley historical association, which held most of the sessions of its annual meeting in the building on May 9, 10, and 11, 1918. On May 11 — the sixtieth anniversary of the admission of Minnesota to the union — the building was dedicated, the dedicatory address being delivered by Frederick Jackson Turner of Harvard university on the subject "Middle western pioneer democracy."

Several changes and additions in the staff of the society have been noted. Miss Ethel B. Virtue, formerly of the staff of the historical department of Iowa, has accepted a position with the Minnesota historical society and is in charge of the manuscript department; Miss Ruth O. Roberts, formerly assistant in the museum of the Wisconsin historical society, has taken up her work as curator of the museum of the Minnesota historical society; other appointments to the staff are: Miss Ilona B. Schmidt as head cataloguer, Miss Elsa R. Nordin as catalogue

assistant, and Mr. Willoughby M. Babcock, Jr., as editorial assistant.

The *Twentieth biennial report* of the Minnesota historical society, issued recently, lists twenty-two persons as constituting the regular staff of the society at the beginning of the year 1919. The total number of books and pamphlets in the library is estimated at 131,046. An act of the legislature of the state of Minnesota, approved on April 4, 1919, authorizes the Minnesota historical society to act as custodian of the archives of the state, and considerable progress has been made in the transfer of archival material from the governor's office in the state capitol to quarters in the new fireproof building of the society. Local as well as state records will be received and as rapidly as possible put in systematic order, catalogued, and made available for use.

Mr. Dan E. Clark, who had been connected with the staff of the State historical society of Iowa for thirteen years, left the position of associate editor in 1918 to take up Red Cross work. The position was filled in September, 1919, by the appointment of Mr. John C. Parish, recently professor of history at Colorado college and formerly connected with the society. The usual activities and publications of the society have been continued, their nature and content, however, being somewhat modified to take cognizance of Iowa's part in the world war and in earlier wars. The society has made a large increase in membership in the past two years.

The historical department of Iowa, located at Des Moines, has continued its work of securing moving picture films of historic incidents. Mr. Edgar Harlan, curator of the department, has been energetic in fostering the establishment in Iowa of parks both for conservation and historic purposes.

The fifteenth annual meeting of the State historical society of Missouri was held at Columbia on January 8, 1918, the president of the society, Mr. Walter B. Stephens, opening the meeting with remarks on the significance of the day, the one-hundredth anniversary of the presentation to congress of Missouri's first petition for statehood. The sixteenth annual meeting, scheduled for December 13, 1918, was indefinitely postponed on account of the influenza epidemic. The secretary's statement,

however, in the *Missouri historical review*, gives indication of encouraging increases in membership, library accessions, and newspaper volumes, the last-mentioned department showing a growth for the biennium of twenty-six per cent. The society now has a library staff of six persons. A loss was sustained by the society in 1918 in the death at sea of Mr. Ivan Hollis Epperson, who was chief of the newspaper and document departments of the society until he entered the service of the United States in the winter of 1917.

The Missouri historical society held a special meeting at the Jefferson memorial building, St. Louis, on May 22, 1919. An illustrated lecture on the expedition of Lewis and Clark was given by Mr. Azel Hull Fish. That the valuable manuscript collections of this society have been of great use to historical students of the Mississippi valley is indicated by the material published in volume IX of the *South Dakota historical collections*, noticed below.

The Nebraska state historical society has begun a survey of the state for historical materials through field work carried on in the southeastern part of the state by Mr. Frank A. Harrison. In Nemaha county valuable records were discovered, including early official records, letters, maps, and civil war material.

In the fall of 1918, Mr. Addison E. Sheldon, secretary of the society, made a more extended field trip when he left for France, his mission being to study on the western front the part Nebraska was playing in the world war.

The society reported, in 1918, a membership of over eleven hundred persons, a museum of about forty thousand objects, a library of fifty-two thousand books and pamphlets, and ten thousand bound volumes of newspapers. Six members constitute its office staff.

The legislature of 1917 granted an appropriation of $22,200 for the use of the society. Announcement has been made that volume XIX of the *Publications* of the Nebraska state historical society is nearly ready to be distributed. The society has been actively engaged in preparation for the celebration on October 11, 1919, of the centennial of the founding by United States

troops of Fort Atkinson, for many years the westernmost outpost of the United States military force.

The Wyoming historical society has for long years suffered from a lack both of funds and of a permanent place of abode. The state librarian and ex officio custodian of the society in her last biennial report makes a plea for an appropriation of $10,000 from the legislature. She states that in the process of being crowded out of one home after another the society has lost much valuable historical material. The appropriation of $250 a year has not been changed since the society was created in 1895.

The Colorado state historical and natural history society has inaugurated a campaign for larger membership. The society moved a few years ago into a fine new historical building and can thus display and make available its valuable museum, library, and other collections. The last legislature granted to the society, beside the sums appropriated in previous years, $6000 for the expenses of war history records, $2000 for cataloguing collections, and $2000 for an assistant curator. It also increased by $500 the sum allowed for binding, and added a like sum to the incidental fund. These appropriations will enable the society to enlarge its activities.

In the biennium under review two meetings of the Mississippi valley historical association have occurred, both being held within the region under consideration in this article. The 1918 meeting took place at St. Paul, Minnesota, on May 9, 10, and 11, and the papers read at its sessions have for the most part been published in the *Proceedings* of the association; those bearing upon the trans-Mississippi northwest are mentioned in this review under "Publications of historical societies." The 1919 meeting was held at St. Louis, on May 8, 9, and 10. Among the papers which fall within the scope of this review are the following: *A frontier officer's old military order book*, by Louis Pelzer, referring to the manuscript volume containing the military orders of Colonel Henry Dodge from 1832 to 1836; *Steamboating on the upper Mississippi after the civil war*, by Lester B. Shippee; *Henry Hastings Sibley and the Minnesota frontier*, by Wilson P. Shortridge; and *What Iowa is doing to record recent war history*, by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.

War History Activities

In view of the increasing attention given to the collection and publication of war history material, it has been thought best to give a brief separate account of such activities. The state of Minnesota has been particularly active in this line. In August, 1918, the Minnesota commission of public safety authorized the establishment of a Minnesota war records commission. This body was appointed and began to organize the state for the collection of war history material. It has published two bulletins, entitled *A statewide movement for the collection and preservation of Minnesota war records* and *Minnesota's part in the war. Shall it be adequately recorded?* The legislature of the state in 1919 made the commission a statutory one with a membership composed of the president of the Minnesota historical society, the chairman of the department of history of the University of Minnesota, the adjutant-general, the state superintendent of education, and five other citizens to be appointed by the governor. Mr. Franklin F. Holbrook is secretary of the commission. The sum of $10,000 for the biennium was appropriated for the use of the commission, and counties and municipalities in the state were also authorized to make appropriations for the use of the commission's county war records committees. The commission contemplates not only the collection of material but also the preparation and publication of a comprehensive documentary and narrative history of Minnesota's part in the war.

In Iowa three state agencies are engaged in war history activities. The last legislature created the Iowa war roster commission, consisting of the governor and adjutant-general of the state, and granted an appropriation of $20,000 for the preparation and publication of a roster of Iowa soldiers, sailors, and marines in the recent Mexican border service and in the world war. The historical department of Iowa, at Des Moines, has been active in gathering information — through questionnaires and otherwise — in regard to Iowa soldiers. A special effort has been made to secure data upon the casualties among the men from the various Iowa counties. The state historical society has continued during the biennium its publication of the pamphlet series *Iowa and war.* Two numbers of this series are: *A tentative outline for a county war history* and *A tentative out-*

line for a state war history; upon the general plan of the latter outline the society contemplates the publication of a series of volumes dealing with Iowa's part in the war. One volume is nearly ready for the press.

In both Missouri and Nebraska provision has been made for the compilation and publication of rosters under the direction of the adjutant-general, in Nebraska an appropriation of $25,000 having been made for that purpose. The secretary of the State historical society of Missouri has, since October, 1917, been publishing in the *Missouri historical review* a series of articles under the title "Missouri and war." Six numbers have appeared and they contain valuable information upon the part played by Missouri in the world war. The secretary of the Nebraska state historical society announced in January, 1919, that the society was gathering material for the publication of an account of the deeds of Nebraska men and women during the years of the war.

A war history commission for North Dakota has been appointed by the governor of the state, and an appropriation of $2500 has been made for the purpose of collecting and publishing North Dakota war history materials. Mr. O. G. Libby of the University of North Dakota is chairman of the commission; and the other members are Mr. Charles F. Amidon of Fargo and Mr. Melvin R. Gilmore of Bismarck.

In Wyoming the war history work was assigned to a war history committee with Agnes R. Wright, state librarian and ex officio custodian of the Wyoming historical society, as chairman. The committee organized the state in September, 1918, for the collection of war history materials and the records of individual soldiers.

The Colorado state historical and natural history society has been granted an appropriation of $6000 for war history work and is actively engaged in the collection of materials. Lists of men who entered the army or navy through induction were secured from the draft boards and questionnaires have been sent out for the purpose of gaining information on civilian war work as well as military and naval service. The records of the state war council have been turned over to the society. The collection of materials, with a view to ultimate publication, has also been

carried on by Mr. James F. Willard, editor of the *University of Colorado historical collections.*

Without doubt activities of which the writer has not received information are in progress in the states which are not mentioned in the above review.

Publications of Historical Societies

The Minnesota historical society has issued regularly its quarterly publication, the *Minnesota history bulletin.* The issues for the past two years contain articles as follows: "Ole Rynning's true account of America," by Theodore C. Blegen; "James J. Hill," by Joseph G. Pyle; "The organization of the volunteer army in 1861 with special reference to Minnesota," by John D. Hicks; "Social and economic effects of the civil war with special reference to Minnesota," by Lester B. Shippee; "The influence of geographic factors in the development of Minnesota," by Chessley J. Posey; "Dakota portraits," by Stephen R. Riggs; "America's fight for public opinion," by Guy Stanton Ford; "William Gates Le Duc," by Gideon S. Ives; and "The birth notices of a state," by Herbert C. Varney. The society has also issued its *Twentieth biennial report,* covering the years 1917 and 1918.

The State historical society of Iowa has published in the past two years the following volumes: *Marches of the dragoons in the Mississippi valley,*[1] by Louis Pelzer; *History of economic legislation in Iowa,*[2] by Ivan L. Pollock; *Legal and political status of women in Iowa,*[3] by Ruth A. Gallaher; *The Spirit Lake Massacre,*[4] by Thomas Teakle; *Old Fort Snelling, 1819-1858,*[5] by Marcus L. Hansen; and two volumes in the *Iowa biographical series: James Baird Weaver,*[6] by Fred Emory Haynes, and *William Peters Hepburn,*[7] by John E. Briggs.

The small pamphlet series published by the society under the

[1] Reviewed *ante,* 5: 230.
[2] Reviewed *ante,* 5: 494 ff.
[3] Reviewed in this number.
[4] Reviewed *ante,* 5: 496.
[5] To be reviewed later.
[6] To be reviewed later.
[7] To be reviewed later.

title *Iowa and war* has been continued by the issuance of numbers 5 to 21 with the titles: *Iowa and war*, by Cyril B. Upham; *Sanitary fairs—a method of raising funds for relief work in Iowa during the civil war*, by Earl S. Fullbrook; *Old Fort Madison*, by Jacob Van der Zee; *The State university of Iowa and the civil war*, by Mrs. Ellen M. Rich; *The Black Hawk war*, by Jacob Van der Zee; *Border defense in Iowa during the civil war*, by Dan E. Clark; *The Spirit Lake massacre*, by Dan E. Clark; *The Mexican war*, by Cyril B. Upham; *Iowa war proclamations; An Iowa flag*, by Ruth A. Gallaher; *The first three liberty loans in Iowa*, by Nathaniel R. Whitney; *Social work at Camp Dodge; Organized speaking in Iowa during the war*, by Bertha M. H. Shambaugh; *The State historical society of Iowa in war times*, by Benjamin F. Shambaugh; *The history of Iowa's part in the world war; A tentative outline for a county war history*; and *A tentative outline for a state war history*. The society plans to add three numbers at an early date, thus completing the second volume.

In the *Iowa journal of history and politics* for the period under review, the following articles have appeared: "The Iowa war loan of 1861," by Ivan L. Pollock; "The legislation of the thirty-seventh general assembly of Iowa," by Frank E. Horack; "Arms and equipment for the Iowa troops in the civil war," by Cyril B. Upham; "State finances in Iowa during the civil war," by Ivan L. Pollock; "Early reports concerning the Des Moines river"; "Relief work in Iowa during the civil war," by Earl S. Fullbrook; "The death of General Albert Sidney Johnston on the battlefield of Shiloh," by Joseph W. Rich; "Frontier defense in Iowa, 1850-1865," by Dan Elbert Clark; "The ages of the soldiers in the civil war," by W. W. Gist; "The influence of wheat and cotton on Anglo-American relations during the civil war," by Louis Bernard Schmidt; "Social work at Camp Dodge," by Fred E. Haynes; "The speaker of the house of representatives in Iowa," by Cyril B. Upham; "The American occupation of Iowa, 1833 to 1860," by Cardinal Goodwin; "Historical survey of civic instruction and training for citizenship in Iowa," by Clarence Ray Aurner; "The president of the senate in Iowa," by Cyril B. Upham; "Historical survey of the militia

in Iowa, 1838-1865," by Cyril B. Upham; and "The movement of American settlers into Wisconsin and Minnesota," by Cardinal Goodwin.

The historical department of Iowa, located at Des Moines, has issued no numbers of its quarterly, *Annals of Iowa*, during the past two years. In 1918 it published *Iowa authors and their works — a contribution toward a bibliography*, by Alice Marple, assistant curator of the department.

During the period from 1917 to 1919 the Missouri historical society, located at St. Louis, has issued no historical publications. The State historical society of Missouri, located at Columbia and housed in the new library building of the University of Missouri, has issued its regular quarterly publication, the *Missouri historical review*. The issues are largely taken up with the following continued articles: "How Missouri counties, towns and streams were named," by David W. Eaton; "Gottfried Duden's 'Report,' 1824-1827," translated by William G. Bek; "Missouri and the war," by Floyd C. Shoemaker; "Missouri-Montana highways," by H. A. Trexler; "Missourians abroad," contributed by various writers and dealing with the services of George Creel, E. H. Crowder, G. W. P. Hunt, Edward R. Stettinius, David R. Francis, and Robert E. Coontz; "Early days on Grand river and the Mormon war," by Rollin J. Britton. A series of occupational retrospects includes the following numbers: "The Missouri soldier one hundred years ago," by William R. Gentry; "The Missouri merchant one hundred years ago," by J. B. White; and "The lawyer in Missouri one hundred years ago," by John F. Philips. Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker contributes two memorial articles — appreciations of Francis A. Sampson, for many years secretary of the state historical society, and Judge John F. Philips. Other articles are: "The national railroad convention in St. Louis, 1849," by R. S. Cotterill; "History of the state flag of Missouri," by Robert Burett Oliver; "Missouri capitals and capitols," by Jonas Viles; "The *Missouri Intelligencer and Boon's Lick Advertiser*," by E. W. Stephens; and "Missouri's centennial," by Floyd C. Shoemaker.

The Kansas state historical society published, in 1918, volume XIV of the *Kansas historical collections*. It is issued as a double

number to cover a period of four years—1915 to 1918. About forty articles are contained in the volume, including a number of short biographies as well as addresses and accounts of the early history of Kansas. Source material is represented by "Some Ingalls letters," "Dr. Albert Morrall: pro-slavery soldier in Kansas in 1856. Statement and autobiography," "The civil war diary of John Howard Kitts," and "Letters concerning the Presbyterian mission in the Pawnee country, near Bellevue, Neb., 1838-1849." Among the more important articles are: "Campaigning in the army of the border," by Albert Robinson Greene; "Notes on the early Indian occupancy of the great plains," by William E. Connelley; "The Kansas penitentiary," by Frank M. Gable; and "The prairie band of Pottawatomie Indians," by William E. Connelley.

A new historical magazine appeared in the field in 1918. Under the title *Nebraska history*, the Nebraska state historical society launched a monthly journal in February, 1918, with the idea of making it a piece of popular literature as distinguished from the academic type of publication. It is edited by A. E. Sheldon, secretary of the society. At the beginning of the second volume—in January, 1919—it was changed to a quarterly and enlarged. It contains articles, comments, reprints, notes, some poetry, and many illustrations. In the first number is a brief sketch of the Nebraska state historical society, and among other items a reprint of materials on "The first war on the Nebraska frontier." Succeeding issues contain: "The union club—civil war substitute for council of defense," "Stories of early Nemaha county settlers," "The Platte river," giving a partial list of names by which the Platte has been known in the past; "Nebraska in 1864-1867," "The French settlement at Julian," "Fort Mitchell cemetery," "Nebraska's dead," "Base hospital 49," "Ancient Pawnee medal," and a continuing account of the "Passing of Nebraska pioneers."

Volume XVIII of the *Publications* of the Nebraska state historical society[8] appeared in the latter part of 1917 under the editorship of Albert Watkins, historian of the society. The frontispiece is a portrait of the late Clarence S. Paine, for many years the secretary of the society; and the first article is "In memo-

[8] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 500.

riam — Clarence S. Paine," by John L. Webster, president of the society. The volume contains the proceedings of the society for the years from 1908 to 1917; biographies of James B. Kitchen, Jefferson H. Broady, and Lorenzo Crounse; and the following historical papers: "Acknowledging God in constitutions," by Reverend William Murphy; "Nebraska reminiscences," by William M. DeCoursey French; "The rural carrier of 1849," by John K. Sheen; "Trailing Texas long-horn cattle through Nebraska," by James H. Cook; "Neapolis, near-capital," by Albert Watkins; "Controversy in the senate over the admission of Nebraska," by John Lee Webster; and "How Nebraska was brought into the union," by Albert Watkins. The first four named appear in the proceedings; the last three are formal papers in the back of the volume.

Another new historical publication is to be noted from Nebraska. The first volume of *Reminiscences and proceedings* of the Nebraska territorial pioneers' association has appeared under the editorship of Minnie P. Knotts. Among its articles are: "When the town of Lancaster was changed to Lincoln," by J. C. F. McKesson; "The feast of Mondamin," by M. A. Brown; "Early days in Nebraska," by Mrs. Fred Goosman; "Nebraska's pioneers in history," by Mrs. Minnie P. Knotts; and "Reminiscences of government surveying," by Robert Harvey.

In 1918 appeared volume IX of the *South Dakota historical collections.* The most notable contribution to this volume is an abstract, made by Charles E. DeLand, of the journal kept at Fort Tecumseh and Fort Pierre on the upper Missouri river for portions of the years 1830, 1831, 1832, and 1833, and of letter books for periods extending down to 1848. The abstracts were made from the originals on file in the collections of the Missouri historical society at St. Louis. Other contributions to the volume are: "Dakota's first soldier," a history of the first Dakota cavalry, 1862-1865, by A. M. English; "The Lesueur tradition," by Doane Robinson; an article entitled "Ending the outbreak," dealing with the Sioux uprising of 1862; "Sioux games," by James R. Walker; and "Lewis and Clark in South Dakota," by Doane Robinson.

A volume of *Wyoming historical society miscellanies,* 1919, has recently been issued. Its contents are as follows: "Some

of the early newspapers of Wyoming," by W. E. Chaplin; a letter from John H. Gordon on "Wheatland colony"; "The true story of the Lost Cabin mines"; a copy of a letter written by S. V. Miller, from Salem, Oregon, November 24, 1852; "The Texas trail," by John B. Kendrick; and a "Letter written for the Cheyenne industrial club by Hiram B. Kelly." There has also appeared the *Biennial report* of the Wyoming historical society for the period from October 1, 1916, to October 1, 1918.

Although Colorado is a fertile field for the historian and valuable materials for publication have in fact been collected by the curator of the Colorado state historical and natural history society, the state has not given to the society sufficient support to enable it to issue an historical quarterly or other formal publication. The society has, however, issued a series of small leaflets. One of these gives a general statement concerning the purposes and collections of the society. Others deal with the historical and scientific collections and the arrangements of the exhibits of the society.

Articles in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review which treat of the region under consideration are: "A larger view of the Yellowstone expedition, 1819-1820," by Cardinal Goodwin; "A plan for the union of British North America and the United States," by Theodore C. Blegen; "The first railroad between the Mississippi and Lake Superior," by Lester B. Shippee; and "Early agitation for a Pacific railroad, 1845-1850," by Robert S. Cotterill. Among the notes and documents printed in the same periodical the following concern the trans-Mississippi northwest: "A reconsideration of gold discoveries in the northwest," by William Trimble; "A letter from New Madrid, 1789"; "Letters of John Ball, 1832-1833," dealing with experiences on the Wyeth expedition; "A fragmentary journal of William L. Sublette," covering the months of May and part of June, 1843.

The *Proceedings* of the Mississippi valley historical association for 1916-1917 and 1917-1918, published in October, 1918, and May, 1919, as extra numbers of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, contain several articles which are of interest to the region under survey. They are as follows: "Fur trading companies in the northwest, 1760-1816," by Wayne E. Stevens; "Six constitutions of the far northwest," by John D. Hicks;

"Popular sovereignty and the colonization of Kansas from 1854 to 1860," by William O. Lynch; "Missouri in the Kansas struggle," by Mary J. Klem; "The collapse of the steamboat traffic upon the Mississippi: an inquiry into causes," by Paul W. Brown; and "The evolution of Montana agriculture in its early period," by M. L. Wilson.

There are no articles in the last two volumes of the *American historical review* which concern the trans-Mississippi northwest. Under the department of "Documents," however, in the number for January, 1919, is a series contributed by Walter B. Douglas, which throws considerable light upon the career of Captain Nathaniel Pryor, a member of the Lewis and Clark expedition. These documents cover the years from 1819 to 1831 and disprove the theory that a Nathaniel Pryor who arrived in California with the Patties in 1828 was the same individual as the Pryor of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Other Historical Publications

In four of the commonwealths beyond the Mississippi, state histories have been issued in the last two years. In each case it has been a private undertaking, not a historical society publication. *Minnesota, the star of the north*,[9] by Mary Vance Carney, is a school history of the state. *A history of Missouri*,[10] by Eugene M. Violette, fills the need for a new manual of Missouri history and provides a book of reference to be used in the high schools of the state in connection with courses in American history. *A standard history of Kansas and Kansans* is a more comprehensive work in five volumes issued by the Lewis publishing company; the author is William E. Connelley, secretary of the Kansas state historical society. *A history of Wyoming* in three volumes has been issued under the editorship of I. S. Bartlett. It is published by the S. J. Clarke publishing company, Chicago.

A considerable body of material relating to the Indians of the northwest has appeared in the last two years. Among the books falling wholly or in part in this field are: *Agriculture of the Hidatsa Indians, an Indian interpretation*, by Gilbert Liv-

[9] Noticed *ante*, 6: 303.

[10] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 497.

ingstone Wilson (Minneapolis); *Corn among the Indians of the upper Missouri*, by George F. Will and George E. Hyde (St. Louis); *John P. Williamson, a brother to the Sioux*, by Winifred W. Barton (New York); *Indian heroes and chieftains*, by Charles A. Eastman (Boston); *The American Indians north of Mexico*, by William H. Miner (Cambridge); *Our debt to the red man*, by Louise Seymour Houghton (Boston); *Teepee neighbors*, by Grace Coolidge (Boston); *Boys' book of Indian warriors and heroic Indian women*, by Edwin L. Sabin (Philadelphia); and *General Crook and the fighting Apaches*, by Edwin L. Sabin (Philadelphia). *Bulletin* 61 of the Bureau of American ethnology is a volume by Frances Densmore on *Teton Sioux music.*[11] *The path on the rainbow*, edited by George W. Cronyn (New York), is an addition to anthologies of North American Indian songs and chants. *The American Indian: an introduction to the anthropology of the new world*,[12] by Clark Wissler, is a general treatise but contains material of value to the student of the Indians of the plains area.

In the field of periodical literature, the *American Indian magazine* for October-December, 1917, is a special Sioux number; the February, 1918, number of the *Minnesota law review* contains an article on "Indian land titles in Minnesota," by Gordon Cain; and in *Autumn leaves* for July, 1918, is a brief article on "Indian relics in Iowa." The January, 1918, number of the *Journal of the United States cavalry association* contains an article on "The battle of Slim Buttes," fought against the Sioux Indians in 1876. The May-June, 1918, number of *North woods* (St. Paul) contains an article entitled "What forestry has done for the Chippewa Indians," by General C. C. Andrews; and in the *American anthropologist* for October-December, 1918, is an article by George Bird Grinnell on "Early Cheyenne villages."

Several biographical and autobiographical volumes deserve notice in this review. *A life of James J. Hill*,[13] by Joseph Gilpin Pyle has recently appeared. *My story*, an autobiography of General Anson Mills, U. S. A., tells of General Crook's cam-

[11] Reviewed *ante*, 6: 141.
[12] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 352.
[13] Reviewed *ante*, 5: 223.

paigns of 1875 and 1876 against the Sioux in the territories of Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana. *A son of the middle border*, by Hamlin Garland, is an autobiographical volume depicting life in Iowa during the period following the civil war. *Tributes to Henry Wallace* is a volume of appreciations of the life of the late editor of *Wallace's farmer*. There has also been recently published, under the title *Uncle Henry's own story*, a collection of intimate letters written by Henry Wallace to his great-grandchildren.

Among recent books which concern the western part of the upper Mississippi valley are the following: *The fur trade of North America and some of the men who made it and maintain it*, by Albert Lord Belden (New York); *The political history of the public lands from 1840 to 1862*,[14] by George M. Stephenson; *The valley of democracy*, by Meredith Nicholson (New York); *Fourth street*, by A. J. Russell (Minneapolis), the history of a street in Minneapolis for long years devoted to the newspaper profession; *A study of state aid to public schools in Minnesota*,[15] by Raymond Asa Kent; *Final report of the international joint commission on the Lake of the Woods reference* (Washington and Ottawa); *A history of Clay and Norman counties, Minnesota; their people, industries, and institutions*, edited by John Turner and C. K. Semling (Indianapolis); *Iowa stories*, book two, by Clarence Ray Aurner (Iowa City); *A brief history of Malvern*, by John D. Paddock (Malvern, Iowa); and *The early history of Grand Forks, North Dakota*, by H. V. Arnold (Larimore, North Dakota). *Bulletin* number 12 of the *Nebraska historical and political science series* is a monograph by Knute Emil Carlson on *The exercise of the veto power in Nebraska*. An interesting study of religious affairs in the western states is found in *Frontier missionary problems; their character and solution*, by Bruce Kinney (New York). *The land grant of 1862 and the land-grant colleges*, by Benjamin F. Andrews, constitutes number 13 of the *Bulletins* of the United States bureau of education for 1918, and contains historical material on the northwestern states.

Among the volumes which have been published by the Yale

[14] Reviewed in this number.

[15] Reviewed in this number.

university press in the series of *Chronicles of America*, the following are of especial interest to the trans-Mississippi northwest: *The red man's continent: a chronicle of aboriginal America*,[16] by Ellsworth Huntington; *Crusaders of New France: a chronicle of the fleur-de-lis in the wilderness*,[17] by William Bennett Munro; *The conquest of New France: a chronicle of the colonial wars*,[18] by George M. Wrong; *The old northwest: a chronicle of the Ohio valley and beyond*,[19] by Frederic Austin Ogg; *The reign of Andrew Jackson: a chronicle of the frontier in politics*,[20] by Frederic Austin Ogg; *The forty-niners: a chronicle of the California trail and El Dorado*,[21] by Stewart Edward White; *The passing of the frontier: a chronicle of the old west*,[22] by Emerson Hough; *The anti-slavery crusade: a chronicle of the gathering storm*,[23] by Jesse Macy; and *Abraham Lincoln and the union: a chronicle of the embattled north*,[24] by Nathaniel W. Stephenson.

Among the magazines there is much material of interest to the region under review. The *Saturday evening post* has recently been running a series of articles by Emerson Hough and others on historic trails and other topics of interest to the west. The *Nation* for June 7, 1919, has an article by Isaac Joslin Cox on "Mississippi valley history." In its series of "State builders of the west," the *Western magazine* has recently printed sketches of four governors of Minnesota: Stephen Miller, William R. Marshall, Cushman K. Davis, and John Sargent Pillsbury. The *Journal of geography* for February, 1918, contains "A comparison of transportation on the Mississippi basin rivers and the Great lakes," by A. E. Parkins. "The northeastern Minnesota forest fires of October 12, 1918," by H. W. Richardson, is a report appearing in the *Geographical review* for April, 1919. "A history of medicine in Iowa," by D. S. Fairchild, covering the period from 1820 to 1840, appears in the September,

16 To be reviewed later.
17 To be reviewed later.
18 To be reviewed later.
19 To be reviewed later.
20 To be reviewed later.
21 Reviewed *ante*, 6: 138.
22 Reviewed *ante*, 6: 138.
23 Reviewed in this number.
24 To be reviewed later.

1918, issue of the *Journal of the Iowa state medical society.* The January-March, 1919, number of *Iowa conservation* contains the following: "Historical sketch of the park region about McGregor, Iowa, and Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin," by Althea R. Sherman; "What the legislature did with reference to state parks in Iowa," by L. H. Pammel; and "A method of preserving places of historical and natural interest," by G. Perle Wilson Schmidt. "Roosevelt's ranch life in North Dakota," is described by Albert T. Vollweiler in the October, 1918, number of the *Quarterly journal* of the University of North Dakota. "Montana" is the subject of an article by Grant E. Finch in the *Journal of geography* for April, 1918.

A notable addition to the materials on the history of the state of Colorado is promised in the publication of the *University of Colorado historical collections*, under the editorship of James F. Willard, head of the department of history. The first volume was issued in 1918 and contains about four hundred pages of documents on *The Union colony at Greeley, Colorado, 1869-1871*,[25] with an introduction by the editor. The plan of the *Collections* is to publish "documents and other material primarily relating to the history of Colorado," and after the colony series — which will include several volumes — is completed, subjects coming within the period prior to Colorado's admission as a state will be dealt with.

The list of doctoral dissertations in history in progress in December, 1917, includes the following which presumably should contain material of interest to the region covered by this review: "The woolen industry in the Mississippi valley prior to the introduction of the factory system," by H. H. Bass (Harvard); "The relations between the public domain and the cattle industry in the United States," by W. M. Babcock, Jr. (Harvard); "The history of the meat-packing industry in the United States," by E. H. Hahne (Harvard); "A history of the whig party in the northwest from 1840," by W. O. Lynch (Harvard); "Western state making, 1888-1890," by J. D. Hicks (Wisconsin); "American exploration and travel in the far west, 1821-1849," by J. J. Hill (California); "The early history of the education of women in the northwest," by A. E. Stanley (Chicago);

[25] Reviewed in this number.

"Migrations to the northwest, 1830-1850," by J. C. Bell, Jr. (Columbia); "The history of protestant missions to the Sioux and Chippewa Indians," by L. F. Jackson (Harvard); "Organized railroad booking in the Mississippi valley, 1837-1857," by R. S. Cotterill (Wisconsin); "Disunion sentiment in the northwest, 1860-1861," by H. C. Hubbart (Chicago); "The railroad history of the granger northwest, 1850-1873," by Frederick Merk (Harvard); "The social and economic development of Minnesota, 1867-1880," by Gladys C. Blakely (Minnesota); "The historical geography of St. Paul," by C. J. Posey (Chicago); "The historical geography of the Ozark region of Missouri," by C. O. Sauer (Chicago); and "The Mennonites of Kansas," by H. E. Jensen (Chicago).

Acquisition of Source Materials

Numerous items of value have been acquired recently by the Minnesota historical society. The family of the late General William G. LeDuc has presented to the society a collection of manuscripts, printed material, and museum items illustrating the period from 1838 to 1905. Other collections received recently are: a body of printed and manuscript material from the estate of the late Major William D. Hale, civil war veteran; the papers of William S. King, and of the pioneer missionary, the Reverend T. S. Williamson; a collection of papers of Joseph R. and Samuel J. Brown; material from the estate of the late Major Thomas Perry Wilson of St. Paul, including manuscript records kept during the civil war. Several interesting diaries and autobiographical accounts have been received, including the civil war diary of John Kinsley Wood covering the years 1862-1865; a copy of the journal of Dr. William D. Dibb, government physician and surgeon with the Fisk expeditions of 1862, 1863, and 1864; and two small manuscript volumes containing an account by the Reverend Samuel W. Pond of his experiences as a missionary among the Dakota Indians in Minnesota, the period covered being from 1831 to about 1880. A collection of about four hundred Pond letters is being photostated for the society's collection. The society has also been able to make a photostat copy of a journal of an overland trip by Benjamin Densmore in 1857 from St. Paul to Ottertail lake by way of Little Falls and

Long Prairie. A three-volume narrative of the civil war, compiled by Colonel J. C. Donahower of the second Minnesota volunteers, and a collection of letters of General LeRoy Upton, commander of the ninth infantry at Chateau-Thierry and of the fifty-seventh brigade in the Argonne, have been acquired by the society. It has also recently come into possession of the archives of the surveyors-general of logs of Minnesota for the first and second districts, 1854-1917.

Among the items received by the State historical society of Iowa are a collection of letters and clippings of Samuel J. Kirkwood, civil war governor of Iowa, donated by Mrs. Kirkwood; the papers of the Bradford academy association; and a large body of records and reports from the office of camp utilities of Camp Dodge, Iowa, giving invaluable data in regard to the construction and maintenance of the national army cantonment at which the eighty-eighth division was trained. Two valuable civil war manuscripts have been acquired by the society: one is a diary kept by Colonel John W. Noble of the third Iowa cavalry during the years 1862 to 1865; the other is an account by Colonel Edward F. Winslow, covering the same years and many of the same events inasmuch as Winslow was for a large part of the time in command of a brigade which included the regiment of Colonel Noble. Both Noble and Winslow played an important part in public affairs after the war, the latter as a president of various railroads, the former as a lawyer and secretary of the interior in President Harrison's cabinet.

The Missouri historical society of St. Louis has recently come into possession of a collection of more than a thousand items of the personal and business correspondence of George P. Harrington, assistant secretary of the treasury, 1861-1865, minister from the United States to Switzerland, 1865-1869. The publication of these letters in a volume is contemplated by the society. The society has also acquired letters and autographed engravings of most of the signers of the declaration of independence; a minute book of the court of common pleas of St. Clair county, Indiana territory, held at Cahokia, 1801-1805; and a collection of the original manuscripts of the writings of James O. Broadhead, many of which were unpublished. The collection includes also a large number of private letters covering a period

of a half century. This body of letters is particularly valuable as regards events in Missouri during the period 1860 to 1865. Other recent acquisitions of the Missouri historical society are the private papers of Don Carlos Dehault De Lassus, last Spanish governor of upper Louisiana, and a collection of papers of Frederick Bates, secretary of Louisiana and Missouri territories and later governor of Missouri.

The Colorado state historical and natural history society reports that it is making progress in organizing a card catalogue of its collection of letters, diaries, and accounts by early settlers. The society has valuable material of this nature, throwing light on the exploration and settlement of Colorado and the Rocky mountain region, and this material will now become available to the public.

Celebrations, Pageants, and the Marking of Historic Sites

The fifty-sixth anniversary of the Sioux outbreak of 1862 was commemorated by the Fort Ridgely state park and historical association at the park grounds on the Minnesota river on August 22, 1918.

An historical pageant of Clay county, Iowa, in which five hundred persons took part, was presented at Spencer, Iowa, on September 25, 1918. The pageant, directed by Miss Etta Smith, represented five scenes from as many historical periods. Representations of Indian life, the arrival of the pioneers, agriculture in the early days, present day scenes in Clay county, and Clay county's part in the world war were parts of the program.

The State historical society of Missouri has been actively preparing for a celebration of the anniversaries of events connected with Missouri's admission as a state. A pamphlet on *Missourians one hundred years ago*, by Walter B. Stephens, president of the society, was recently distributed over the state to schools and libraries. The society held its fifteenth annual meeting on January 8, 1918, the one hundredth anniversary of the presentation in congress of Missouri's petition for statehood, and is bending its energies toward assisting the centennial committee —composed of one thousand Missourians—to organize six state-wide centennial celebrations in the years 1920 and 1921.

The Missouri press association held a memorial celebration on

May 9, 1919, at New Franklin, Missouri, to commemorate the founding of the *Missouri Intelligencer and Boon's Lick Advertiser*. This was the first American newspaper printed west of St. Louis, its first issue appearing on April 23, 1819. A monument of stone, indicating the site of the *Missouri Intelligencer* office, was dedicated at this centennial celebration of Missouri's pioneer country newspaper.

A celebration commemorating the Indian battle at Oak Grove station was held in Nuckols county, Nebraska, on June 14, 1918. Oak Grove was a station on the old California trail and was attacked by Sioux and Cheyenne Indians on August 7, 1864. The celebration was under the direction of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the program included the unveiling of a monument commemorative of the occasion, the presentation address being made by Mr. A. E. Sheldon, secretary of the Nebraska state historical society.

John Carl Parish

State Historical Society of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

Financial Reports Relating to Louisiana, 1766-1788

A complete study of the activities of the Spaniards within the present boundaries of the United States remains yet to be made. Nevertheless contributions of importance have been made during recent years on the basis of the first-hand sources existing in Spain. Mr. Woodbury Lowery a few years ago contributed extensively to our knowledge of Spain's activities in Florida and the gulf region. Mr. Herbert Bolton's indefatigable labors have added to the store of information regarding the northward advance of the Spaniards from Mexico and their colonial efforts in the southwest. Still more recently Mr. Charles Chapman has given the history of Spain's motives and rule in California and lastly Mr. William E. Dunn of Texas has discussed the Franco-Spanish rivalry for Texas and the gulf region in the seventeenth century. The history of the Mississippi valley during the Spanish period is as yet unwritten. The important archives of Spain, however, are slowly yielding their extensive records on this subject and there now exist in the United States growing collections which aim at the systematic accumulation of material dealing with the later period of Spanish activity in the Mississippi valley and gulf region. A large amount of material has been recently discovered and is now being obtained relative to Spanish designs on Georgia and the Carolinas and treating of the area now included in the present states of Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Missouri, and Illinois.

Of the various classes and categories of historical matter the most uninteresting and unassimilable at first sight, and consequently the most neglected, are the financial records. These may consist of reports of intendants, officials of municipal and provincial finance, records of the central committee of auditing boards, or the records of the central committee of finance of the council of the Indies, the controlling tribunal of the Spanish colonial empire. The time-honored standard authorities of the

type of Bancroft and Prescott will have to be rewritten entirely in the light of the financial records which may some day be brought to light. These records are replete with new and hitherto unknown information on commerce, agriculture, industries, and general economic topics. Without in any sense minimizing the value of diplomatic correspondence, letters of governors and captains-general, accounts of expeditions for conquest, plans of government and legislation and the like as historical material, the assertion may safely be made that no faithful and complete account of the Spanish period of America colonial history can be written without minute reference to the details of colonial finance. It is not going too far to say that this subject has not been given sufficient attention up to the present.

With the idea of inviting attention to the records of this character which exist in complete form for the province of Louisiana the following four typical reports have been selected:

I. A record of the amount of tobacco shipped from Louisiana to Vera Cruz in 1787 and 1788.

II. A statement of income and expenditures of the department of Indian affairs and immigration in Louisiana for the year 1786.

III. A statement of income and expenditures of the province of Louisiana for the year 1786.

IV. A statement of expenditures of the province of Louisiana from January 1, 1766 to December 31, 1785.

CHARLES H. CUNNINGHAM

I

[Letter] No. 523,[1] transmitting a statement of the amount of tobacco shipped this year to the ports of Cadiz and Vera Cruz.

To His Excellency, the Marquis of Sonora.[2].

Most Excellent Sir:

I transmit herewith a statement relative to the quantity of tobacco

1 In the *Archivo general de Indias* (Seville, Spain), 87-1-21, *Audiencia de Santo Domingo*. The original of this report is in the correspondence of the intendant of Louisiana. This collection, now being transcribed and brought to the United States by the author of this note, consists of eleven *legajos* (bundles) and extends from 1783 to 1803.

2 The addressee of this letter was José de Gálvez, who had been visitor of New

belonging to last year's crop which I have forwarded to the ports of Cadiz and Vera Cruz during the current year. Your Excellency will note that to the latter port I have sent 810,694 Castilian pounds [*libras castellanas*] and to the former 673,406 French [pounds], which fact I now communicate for Your Excellency's information and for that of His Majesty. May God guard Your Excellency for many years.

Martin Navarro [3] [rubric].

New Orleans, July 18, 1787.

[Accompanying the foregoing]

Statement of the amount of tobacco belonging to the last year's crop shipped during the current year to the ports of Cadiz [4] *and Vera Cruz (and charged to the royal exchequer) in the following vessels, to wit:*

Brig *San Antonio*, Captain Juan Albella, March 9, 1787, to Cadiz: 200 barrels, 13,888 rolls,[5] weight 58,757 pounds.

Brig *La Tetis*, Captain Francisco Stock, March 26, 1787, to Cadiz: 750 barrels, 53,556 rolls, weight 261,940 pounds.

Spain from 1765 to 1771, and who, on the death of Arriaga in 1775, was made minister of the Indies. He received this report in his capacity of *superintendente general de real hacienda* (general superintendent of the exchequer), which was the culminating office of the financial system devised by Charles III. Various reports to Gálvez and his successors, which deal exclusively with finance, are in the *Archivo general de Indias*, 136-5-3 to 7.

[3] Navarro was intendant of Louisiana at this time. He had accompanied O'Reilly to Louisiana in 1766 and was regularly made intendant in 1783. He returned to Spain in 1788. James A. Robertson, *Louisiana under the rule of Spain, France, and the United States, 1785-1807; social, economic and political conditions of the territory represented in the Louisiana purchase as portrayed in hitherto unpublished contemporary accounts* (Cleveland, 1911), 1: 261; Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana* (New York, 1904), 1: 159. As intendant of the province he exercised supervision over commerce, agriculture, and finance. His reports may be found in the series referred to in note 1.

[4] Tobacco was usually sent from New Orleans to Vera Cruz, which was the regular port of entry and departure for tobacco shipped under Spain's monopoly system. The exceptional circumstances of its direct shipment to Spain of course accounts for the fact that this report was made directly to the minister of the Indies by the intendant of Louisiana instead of following the usual practice of reporting to the *contaduría de tabacos* of New Spain. It was nevertheless customary for the intendant to send to Spain a duplicate of the statement accompanying the shipments to Vera Cruz. A complete series of these transcripts exists in the archives. Herbert I. Priestley, in *José de Gálvez, visitor general of New Spain, 1765-1771* (Berkeley, 1916), 153, states on the authority of Maniau's *Compendio* that no more tobacco was shipped from Louisiana after 1792. For various scattered citations regarding tobacco in Louisiana see Robertson, *Louisiana under the rule of Spain, France, and the United States*, 1: 127, 137, 223, 230, 237, 239, 256, 265, 286, 297.

[5] *Andullos.* This word can not be translated as bales.

Frigate *La Luisiana*, Captain José Urquijo, April 20, 1787, to Cadiz: 906 barrels, 74,318 rolls, 352,709 pounds.

Total to Cádiz: 673,406 pounds.

Brig *Minerva*, Captain Juan Castañedo, February 13, 1787, to Vera Cruz: 62,000 rolls, 280,960 pounds.

Brig *Padre de Famílias*, Captain Predo Badia, February 15, 1787, to Vera Cruz: 81,000 rolls, 366,933-5 pounds.

Brig *Minerva*, Captain Juan Castañedo, June 8, 1787, to Vera Cruz: 33,400 rolls, 162,801-1 pounds.

Total to Vera Cruz: 810,694 pounds.

Grand total (to Cadiz and Vera Cruz) 1,484,100-6 pounds.

Note. The 673,406 pounds sent to Vera Cruz are expressed in *peso francés.* It should be explained that *pesos francés* is 6⅔% more than *peso castellano.*

Martin Navarro [rubric]
New Orleans, July 18, 1787.

[Letter] No. 70, transmitting a statement of the amount of tobacco shipped during the current year to the port of Vera Cruz.

To His Excellency B. F. Antonio Valdez.
Most Excellent Señor:

The enclosed statement will inform Your Excellency as to the quantity of tobacco of last year's crop which I have sent to Vera Cruz for the use and account of the tobacco monopoly of Mexico. You will observe that the total aggregates 908,117 pounds. May God guard Your Excellency many years.

Martin Navarro [rubric]
New Orleans, May 3, 1788.

[Accompanying the foregoing]

Statement showing the amount of tobacco of the last year's crop sent during the current year to the port of Vera Cruz.

	Rolls – Pounds
Shipped on February 26, 1788 by the brig *San Antonio de Padua*, Captain Francisco de Aillon.....	80,569–400,000
Shipped on March 8, 1788 by the brig *Gálvez*, Captain Francisco Arnia	65,041–324,650
Shipped on March 27, 1788 by the brig *Nuestra Señora del Carmen*, Captain Mateo Cordeviola.....	55,465–273,467
	201,075–998,117

Martin Navarro [rubric]
New Orleans, May 3, 1788.

II

[Letter] No. 17,[6] transmitting two statements which show the products, income and expenditures of the royal treasury of the Province of Louisiana for the year 1786.

Statement of the income and expenditures of the Department of Immigration and Indian Affairs [*Ramo de Población y Amistad de Indios*][7] *of the Province of Louisiana for the year 1786, formed in compliance with the royal order of the 30th of July of the current year.*

Receipts

	Silver reales[8]
Balance on hand from last year	137,567–33
Advances [loans] made by the Treasurer General of Military Affairs	1,840,000
Return of funds and properties belonging to this Department	84,749–16
Sale of goods	16,709–27
Total	2,079,027–08

Expenditures

For salaries	42,722–03
For expenses in connection with the settlement of Canary Islanders	387,626–26
Same for the Acadians	1,104,970–25
Expenses of the Department	198,062–10
Total	1,733,381–30
Balance left for the year 1787	345,645–12

Note. This Department has no regular income, with the exception of a stipend of 40,000 *pesos* formerly allotted for its necessary expenses.

[6] *Archivo general de Indias*, 87-1-21.

[7] *Ramo* may be rendered as department, division, or branch. *Población* in this instance has a more significant meaning than population or village. This department had to do with the immigration of settlers and with the administration of the Indians. Literally the meaning of the phrase would be "population and friendship of the Indians."

[8] *Reales de plata fuerte.* The value of the *real de plata* was fixed by the royal decrees of February 28, 1538, July 16, 1595, and January 20, 1642, at 34 maravedís, while the *real de vellón* was evaluated at 68 *maravedís.* The *peso* was estimated at the value of 8 *reales de plata* except in Paraguay, where *pesos* of 6 *reales* were legalized. *Recopilación de leyes de los reinos de las Indias, lib.* 4, *tit.* 25. Bourne, in his "Historical introduction," in Emma H. Blair and James A. Robertson, *The Philippine islands, 1493-1803* (Cleveland, 1903), 1: 39, estimates the value of the *peso* at a dollar, present currency; while Charles E. A. Gayarré, *History of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1885), 1: 186, states that a dollar contained 10 *reales.*

This is not sufficient and has not been since 1779, from which date it has had to bear the expenses of the immigration of settlers from Malaga, the Canaries [9] and the Acadians,[10], as well as the presents made annually to the Indians, and especially in 1784 on the occasion of the celebration of the congresses of Pensacola and Mobile. In order to meet these expenses it has been necessary to ask for advances from the royal treasury of situation [*reales cajas de situación*] and consequently we are indebted to it for extensive sums advanced since the year 1779, when the subsidies to these provinces began to diminish.

Joseph de Orue [rubric]
New Orleans, November 20, 1787.

III

Statement of the income, debts and expenditures of the Royal Treasury of the Province of Louisiana for the year 1786, formulated by the Board of Military Audits [contaduría principal de exército] *in conformity with the royal order of March 30, 1787.*

Divisions of Exchequer

	Silver reales
Situación: gross income	4,333,496–23
Expenditures	2,162,610
Balance	2,170,886–23
Alcabala [11] *de Entrada*	315,518–28
Alcabala de Salida	105,936–28
Alcabala antigua y moderna	3,350–21

[9] Propositions were advanced for the immigration of Canary Islanders to Florida as early as 1675. William E. Dunn, *Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702; the beginnings of Texas and Pensacola* (Austin, 1917), 22, 26.

[10] See Fortier, *History of Louisiana*, 1: 147 ff., and Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, 3: 115, 119, on the subject of the Acadian migration to Louisiana. The last-mentioned authority states (3: 185) that the total Acadian population in 1787, as ascertained by official census, was 1,587. There is considerable data on the subject of the immigration of the Islanders, Acadians, and Malagueños in *Archivo general de Indias*, 87-1-19 to 29 and 86-6-9 to 19, as well as among the Carnegie photographic transcripts of the *Papeles procedentes de Cuba.*

[11] The *alcabala* was a percentage tax levied on all business transactions. As noted here, there were four distinct transactions on which an *alcabala* might be levied. The *derecho de entrada* was a sort of *octroi* paid on transactions involving the entrance of goods to the capital, the *derecho de salida* was paid on sales of goods outwards. These taxes were distinct from the *almojarifazgo* which was an import and export tax. The *alcabala antigua y moderna* at this time was an eight per cent tax, of which two per cent was a war tax levied on January 22, 1782, and reduced to six per cent in 1791. Aside from these, there was an *alcabala* paid on the sale of boats (*venta de embarcaciones*) which produced a fair revenue owing to condi-

Alcabala de venta de embarcaciones	15,412–27
Almojarifazgo [12]	45,597– 6
Armada de Barlovento [13]	1,675–10
Comisos [41]	41,519– 7
Oficios vendibles y renunciables [15]	4,800

tions of transportation prevailing in Louisiana. See *Recopilación, lib.* 8, *tit.* 17, *ley* 11 and note 5, also *lib.* 8, *tit.* 13, *ley* 1. A transcript of the *cédula* of January 22, 1782, exists in the *Archivo general de Indias*, 87-1-20, and another may be found in 136-5-7, together with the order which restored the *alcabala* to six per cent.

[12] *Almojarifazgo*: an import and export tax originating in Spain, but applied to the Americas by Philip II, who, by the *cédulas* of June 24, 1566, and December 28, 1568, ordered a five per cent tax on all goods leaving Seville for the Indies (the ordinance of December 28, 1562, having fixed one at two and one-half per cent) and an import tax in the Indies on these same goods of ten per cent, making in all a tax of fifteen per cent. *Recopilación, lib.* 8, *tit.* 15, *leyes* 1, 2, 8, 10, 22, 24. Priestley (*José de Gálvez*, pp. 364-365) reproduces tables from Fonseca y Urrutia which show that at Vera Cruz from 1785 to 1791, and at Acapulco, from 1786 to 1790, the rate of *almojarifazgo* varied from two and one-half per cent to twenty per cent and two and one-half per cent to thirty-three and one-half per cent, respectively.

[13] *Armada de Barlovento*: this was a form of *avería* levied on merchants and shippers utilizing the American fleets for convoy expenses. The origin of the *avería* dates back to the incursions of the British upon Spanish commerce in the days of Drake and Hawkins. The earliest colonial *avería* mentioned in the laws of the Indies was levied in 1573. *Recopilación, lib.* 9, *tit.* 9, *ley* 43. The *armada* was a special tax levied first in 1635 to aid in the equipment and maintenance of the *Barlovento* (Windward) squadron, which was called into being after the destruction of the Spanish commercial fleet in 1632 by the Dutch and the loss of cargo and specie valued at 12,000,000 *pesos*. The armed fleet at first consisted of fourteen vessels, and an annual contribution of 600,000 *pesos* was levied on the American colonies for its support. Mexico contributed 200,000 *pesos*, which were levied by a two per cent excise. Hubert H. Bancroft, *History of Mexico* (San Francisco, 1883), 3: 83, 103, 202.

[14] *Comisos*: (1) the goods seized, or (2) the penalty of forfeiture incurred in case of conviction of smuggling or the apprehension of a cargo unaccompanied by the proper and necessary shipping papers. The *cédula* of July 11, 1758, ordered that on the detention of a cargo, thirteen per cent should be taken to cover the royal duties (*alcabala* and *almojarifazgo*). One-sixth of the balance went to the judge trying the case and a fourth of the remainder to the informant. The remainder was seized by the government. A subsequent law, promulgated in 1772, ordered that the product of the seizure of all cargoes should be divided into three parts for equal division among the judge, the informants, and the government. *Recopilación, lib.* 8, *tit.* 17, *ley* 7, and *note* 3. As is well known to the student of American history, there was much smuggling in the gulf region during this period.

[15] Salable and renunciable offices: the sale of offices and the payment of a tax by those who renounced them constituted a fruitful source of revenue throughout the Spanish colonial empire. This system was first worked out for Spain in 1522 by Doña Juana and it was applied in full to the colonies by Philip II on November 13, 1581, though the practice of selling offices in the Indies was authorized as early as 1564. The price paid for an office was always higher than the annual income. Indeed, cases have been noted wherein 24,000 *pesos* were paid for the office of pro-

Media annata [16]		377–20
Monte Pío [17] *de Oficinas*, total income		10,222–12
Expenditures	1,796–13	
Balance	8,425–33	
Monte Pío de Ministros		4,391–11
Monte Pío Militar		10,990–29
Expenditures	8,248	
Balance	2,742–29	
Valisa [18]		13,384
Expenditures	15,163	
Charged	1,779	

vincial governor in the Philippines, — more than that official could possibly gain in salary throughout his entire term of six years. Officials made great profits from the exercise of the right to trade. The offices usually sold were those of an administrative character: those of clerks, notaries, secretaries, municipal offices, revenue collectors, and administrators. Judicial offices were sold at times, on occasion of great financial need, though this practice was proscribed by the laws. See *Recopilación, lib.* 8, *tit.* 20, *leyes* 1, 4, 7, 14, 24, 26.

[16] *Media annata* (modern *anata*) or half annat, was an income tax paid by officials of the Spanish colonies. The law of May 22, 1631, which established the *media anata* in America, provided that half of the first year's salary of all royal appointees should be paid into the royal treasury. On November 6, 1642, the tax was increased by half, but on February 17, 1649, was reduced to its original size. In 1664 it was specified that the tax should be paid in two installments, the first directly into the royal treasury at the time of appointment, the second before the end of the first year of service into the treasury of the colony where the appointee was located. The last important law on the subject was promulgated on May 26, 1774. It prescribed different rates and methods of payment for officials of different rank and grade. *Recopilación, lib.* 8, *tit.* 19, *ley* 4 and *note.* See also Priestley, *José de Gálvez*, 334.

[17] A *montepío* was a fund made up by enforced contributions or discounts from the salaries of officials in Spain's colonies. These were collected and administered by the government. The purpose was the accumulation of money for the support of widows and orphans of deceased colonial officials. There were, in effect, three distinct organizations, the *montepío de ministros*, for ministers, judges, and officials of a higher category; the *montepío de oficinas*, for clerks and administrative employees; and the *montepío militar*, for soldiers. These *montepíos* did not insure the lives of soldiers or of officials (see Priestley, *José de Gálvez*, wherein it it stated that they were insurance societies), but rather established funds designed to aid dependents to tide over the period of stress and embarrassment following the death of a husband or father. Orphanages were sometimes partially supported by the *montepíos*, and children were kept and educated in convents and schools at the expense of these organizations. Funds were also furnished by these same sources for the transportation of widows and orphans back to Spain. The *montepío* was a development of the eighteenth century. See Escriche, *Diccionario*, 2: 614. In the *Archivo general de Indias*, 136-5-5 to 7 and 142-2-2 to 7, are a large number of the reports of these *montepíos*, which were audited by the board of audits of the council of the Indies.

[18] *Valisa* (or *valiza*): a tax levied on shipping for the maintenance of buoys and other marks designed to be of aid in navigation.

Penas de Cámara [19]		
Expenditures	30,260	
Charged	30,260	
Total income from the above divisions		4,906,673–28 [20]
Total expended		2,218,077–13 [21]
Balance in favor of the above		2,720,635–15
Balance against		32,039

The above statement shows that there was paid into the General Military Treasury [*Tesorería General de Exército*] of this Province in the year 1786 from the Division of Situation and from other sources of royal income, the sum of 4,906,673 *rs.*, 28 *mrs.*; there was paid out for current expenses the sum of 2,218,077 *rs.* 13 *mrs.*, remaining on hand January 1, 1787 the sum of 2,720, 635 *rs.* 15 *mrs.* The divisions of *Valisa* and *Penas de Cámara* are debited with a balance of expenditures over revenue of 32,039 *rs.* as in 1785, the total balance of which year was 2,339,078 *rs.*, but not reported because not required by royal order.

Note: During the current year payments to invalid soldiers amounted to 32,678 *rs.* 30 *mrs.*, the import of which is included in the total expenditure of Situation.

Addenda: There have not been included in this statement the 1,520,-000 *rs.* taken from the funds of Situation and applied to Immigration and Indian Affairs for extraordinary expenses in addition to the 320,-000 [22] which constituted the regular income of this division.

Addenda: Neither the 64,000 *rs.* contributed this year to the tobacco rent of New Spain, nor the 100,511 *rs.* contributed to the naval establishment at Havana have been included in this account. These sums, added to those of Indian Affairs [*sic*] aforementioned, amount to 2,004,-511 *rs.*, which, subtracted from the net income of the Province, leave remaining the sum of 716,124 *rs.* 15 *mrs.*

[19] *Penas de Cámara*: the revenue obtained from court fines and penalties. In some cases special receivers (*receptores*) were appointed to administer these funds, in others this was attended to by the regular treasury officials. Very explicit laws stipulated the manner of accounting for and administering this money. Matters had grown so lax by 1621 that Philip IV was constrained to forbid the loaning or utilization of these funds for any purpose other than the expenses of the administration of justice. The revenue derived from fines paid but little of the cost of that complete and expensive judicial system which Spain designed for her colonies.

[20] This is the sum of the gross income of *Situation*, plus the sum of the various other divisions indicated above.

[21] Obtained by adding the expenditures of *Situation, Montepío Militar, Valisa*, and *Penas de Cámara.*

[22] The 320,000 *reales* referred to in the report of November 20, 1787, as 40,000 *pesos* (at 8 *reales* the *peso*).

Addenda: The amounts shown herein as derived from customhouse dues and from fines levied on contraband, for which certificates and bills [notes] current in the Province have been accepted, are not considered as having extinguished the debts until actually paid; this ruling is made in the absence of a royal pronouncement on the subject.

Addenda: To the 2,162,610 *reales* expended by the Division of Situation may be added 1,428,233 *rs.* 32 *mrs.* outstanding in certificates of credit issued on account of lack of funds in the year mentioned, as set forth in the *estado general de deudas* [report of liabilities] remitted already to Spain; the total expense of the Division of Situation is shown to be 3,590,843 *rs.* 32 *mrs.*, itemized as follows:

Charged to the three battalions of the regular regiment garrisoning this place, at Pensacola, Mobile, Natchez, and other forts and posts of this Province; militia staff; company of Dragoons and artillery detachment	1,173,671 *rs.* 31 *mr.*
Salary of the General Staff of this Post, army officers and retired officers attached	167,597 " 22 "
Salaries of treasury officials	250,624 " 23 "
Salaries of curates and other ecclesiastical ministers of the colony	21,922 " 17 "
Subsidy to the treasury of Pensacola	160,000 "
Orders drawn by said treasury [Pensacola] and honored by this department	72,354 " 17 "
Paid to the *Monte Pío Militar* covering deductions made in its favor during the current year	10,990 " 22 "
Paid to the *Monte Pío de Ministros*, as above	3,948 " 2 "
Paid to the *Monte Pío de Oficinas*, as above	7,040 " 2 "
Payment of loans made to the royal treasury by various individuals	210,157 "
Balances from former years to be assumed	614,142 " 3 "
Expenses of royal hospitals of this place, Mobile, Natchez, construction of forts at the latter place, purchase of effects for the subsistence of the garrison at Natchez, Mobile, Pensacola, Balize, and New Orleans, and for other extraordinary expenses	897,394 " 31 "

Addenda: This report does not include tobacco, since that subject is considered apart from the regular revenue, its income being noted and reported directly to the auditing department [*contaduría*] of that *ramo* by the officials of New Spain.

Joseph de Orue [signed]
New Orleans, 24 November, 1787.

IV

[Letter] No. 521,[23] transmitting a statement and account of the expenditures of the various branches of the royal exchequer in this Province, in the two decennials from January 1, 1766, until the end of December, 1785.

To His Excellency, the Marquis of Sonora,
Most Excellent Sir:

I transmit herewith a statement and account of all expenditures of the departments of the royal exchequer of this Province, pertaining to the two current decennials from January 1, 1766, to December 31, 1785, which have been formulated by this Board of Military Audits [*contaduría principal de exército*] with the care and conciseness required by the Royal Order of September 6th of last year. May God keep you for many years.

Martin Navarro [signed]
New Orleans, July 18, 1787.

[Enclosed with the above letter]

Expert account and explanation in which this Board of Military Audits summarizes the expenditures of the different branches of the royal exchequer from January 1, 1766, to December 31, 1785, divided into two decennials in accordance with the Royal Order of September 5, 1786, transmitted by this Intendency General, to wit:

First Decennial

1766	*Silver reales*
Situation [*Ramo de Situación*]: including the pay of officials and troops, the general staff and the dependents [*empleados*] of the departments of War and Finance...	227,992
Extraordinary: including the expenses involved in the collection and distribution of provisions and supplies in the Plaza and in the different subsidiary posts, gratifications, house-rental, boat-hire, etc.....	28,688– 6
Marine: including the payment of personnel and the purchase of materials for the outfitting of ships at the expense of the royal exchequer.....	17,633
1767	
Situation: items same as above [1766], with additional expenses incident to spiritual matters [*pasto espiritual*], supplements for French troops, and the payment of armory employees.....	961,052– 6
Extraordinary: items same as above, comprising (for this	

[23] *Archivo general de Indias*, 87-1-21.

year) expenditures for the collection of provisions and other necessaries for the Plaza and outlying military stations, house-rentals, boat-hire, transportation, gratifications, repairs, extensions, and new buildings in the Plaza 61,484

Marine: items same as last year..... 84,292

Immigration and Indian Affairs [*Población y Amistad de Indios*]: this department, which was founded during the current year, expended in behalf of the Acadian families sent from Europe for the settlement of this Province and also for the purchase of provisions and effects for the savage nations..... 60,292

1768

Situation: the demands of this department were the same as last year, consisting chiefly of the payment of officers and men of the former French garrison and their financial officials, prior to the assumption of the command by His Excellency, the Count O'Reilly [*Señor Conde O Relly*]..... 918,202

Extraordinary: this is increased over the expenditures of last year by the payment of French debts contracted prior to the coming of Señor O'Reilly..... 268,636

Marine: items same as last year..... 113,268

Immigration and Indian Affairs: items same as last year.. 23,072

1769

Situation: in addition to the expenses of 1768, this department paid the salaries of the *cabildo* [24] just created, the salaries of the militia just formed by His Excellency and the increase of salaries of the departments of War and Exchequer, as well as those of all the officials and soldiers who came with His Excellency..... 1,444,243

Extraordinary: an increase over the year 1768 by the changes effected by order of His Excellency in the capital and posts, the park of artillery, rental of boats to carry the troops, the debts of the French and other numerous expenses which were incidental to the above-mentioned expedition..... 423,472

[24] *Cabildo*: municipal council. The members of this body, appointive or elective at different times and under varying circumstances, were termed *regidores*. In the larger municipalities such as Mexico, Havana, and Manila, two *alcaldes ordinarios* were elected by the *cabildo* to serve as judges of first instance and at the same time to exercise membership in that body. At times, however, as in the early history of Manila and Mexico, *alcaldes ordinarios* were designated by the governor or viceroy. The term *ayuntamiento* was synonymous with *cabildo*. See *Recopilación, lib.* 4, *tit.* 9, *leyes* 1 to 23.

Marine: additional expense incident to the arrival of the ships of the above-mentioned expedition	194,952
Immigration and Indian Affairs	19,664
1770	
Situation: same as heretofore, deducting the amounts formerly paid to French troops	969,768
Extraordinary: items same as heretofore, deducting former payments to cover debts of the French	203,040
Marine: items the same as formerly, with some diminution in the number of ships and sailors, the items of this account having ceased with this year to be charged to the royal treasury	66,796
Immigration and Indian Affairs: as in 1769 with some diminution in the cost of gifts for Indians	24,304
Situation: items as formerly, less payments to French troops	801,854
Extraordinary: items same as last year, less expenditures to cover French debts in the Province	25,804
Immigration and Indian Affairs: items same as last year	32,599
1772	
Situation: items the same as for the year 1771, with the addition of salaries for school-teachers [*maestros de escuela*] recently arrived, and of the employees of the Royal Hospital and their expenses	876,960
Extraordinary: same items as last year	15,785
Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as last year	43,387
Penas de Cámara: which begins this year	1,949
1773	
Situation: same items as last year	806,390
Extraordinary: same items as last year	7,118
Immigration and Indian Affairs	31,253
Penas de Cámara: same items as last year	369
1774	
Situation: items as formerly	802,887
Extraordinary: same items as formerly	46,076
Immigration and Indian Affairs	36,212
Penas de Cámara: same items as formerly	1,510
1775	
Situation: same items as last year	810,451
Extraordinary: same items as last year	23,614
Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as last year	38,052
Penas de Cámara	
	10,512,120–12

The total expenses of all departments of the royal exchequer in the first decennial amounted to ten million, five hundred and twelve thousand, one hundred and twenty *reales*, twelve *maravedís* [25] of silver [*plata fuerte*] or one million, three hundred and fourteen thousand, fifteen *pesos*, twelve *maravedís* in silver.

Joseph de Orue [rubric]
New Orleans, May 31, 1787.

Second Decennial

1776

Situation: money was paid out under this fund for the following items: support of the General Staff of the Plaza of New Orleans, officers and troops constituting the garrison here, salaries of the employees of the departments of Royal Exchequer and Justice, employees of the Royal Hospital, and other expenses of the last-mentioned institution, pay of the militia garrisoning the various posts, support of the clergy [*pasto espiritual*] and expenses of the *cabildo*	803,018–12
Extraordinary: included in the items for this year are the expenses involved in the collection of provisions and effects for the use of the capital and outlying posts, costs of transportation, rental of storehouses and flatboats, extra expenses in the Plaza and posts, and outlays for the artillery park	49,024
Immigration and Indian Affairs: expenses incurred during present year on account of the Acadian families and other settlers of the Province; purchase of provisions and effects for the Indians	21,085–32
Penas de Cámara	391

1777

Situation: same items as last year	790,833
Extraordinary: same items as last year	114,953
Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as last year with additional expenses incurred in bringing Indians to the capital and posts	109,453
Penas de Cámara: same items as last year	2,274

1778

Situation: same items as last year	848,221
Extraordinary: same items as last year, with some extra expenditure on account of the expeditions of Manchac and Palo Colorado	266,174

[25] Maravedí, a thirty-fourth part of a *real de plata*.

Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as last year, with increases due to the immigration of flax and hemp laborers	148,066
Penas de Cámara	3,992
1779	
Situation: extra expenditure on account of the officers and troop of the Second Battalion, newly created, and of the new companies of dragoons just come from New Spain	1,417,734
Extraordinary: same as usual, with extra expense on account of recruits from the Islands, water, pay of the militia which garrisoned the Plaza during the expedition to Manchac and those serving in that expedition, extra gratifications, the loading of boats, and various extraordinary expenditures to which this expedition gave rise	2,094,424
Immigration and Indian Affairs: items as usual, augmented by the extra expenditures on account of the arrival of settlers, transportation of Indians, Indian gifts, etc	1,028,544
Penas de Cámara: increased expenses on account of the war	6,455
1780	
Situation: same items as those of 1779	1,397,597
Extraordinary: augmented this year by the expenditures on behalf of the expedition to Mobile, the pay of an unassigned company of Germans recruited in Manchac which served voluntarily in this Plaza; loans advanced by the governor to the agent of the United States of America	2,048,131
Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as formerly, with the extra cost of gifts made to Indians serving in the expedition to Manchac	653,050
Penas de Cámara: same items as last year	4,621
1781	
Situation: items as usual, but augmented by the expenditures and upkeep of the conquered forts of Mobile, Manchac, and Palo Colorado, and with the increase of salaries of the General Staff of this Plaza	2,487,272
Extraordinary: same items as usual, with additional expenditure incident to the expedition of Pensacola and the upkeep of the conquered places	3,389,166
Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as heretofore with some increase on account of the transportation of Island immigrants [*Isleños Pobladores*]	857,969
Penas de Cámara: same items as usual but less in amount than the year before	411

1782

Situation: expenditures increased by the upkeep of the conquered places; note the elimination of further expense incident to the unattached company of Germans, which was reorganized..... 1,788,907

Extraordinary: items the same as usual, augmented by the extra expense of the upkeep of Pensacola and the expedition made to suppress the rebellion which occurred at Natchez; extra outlay by the commandant of Illinois in the defense of his post against an Indian uprising; construction of a new fort at Natchez and repairs to the one at Mobile..... 1,463,345

Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as usual but augmented by the expenditures made for thirty-three immigrant families arising at Pensacola; gifts [for Indians] at Mobile, Pensacola, and Illinois; expenses connected with the arrival and transportation of settlers at the capital..... 2,136,902

Penas de Cámara: same items as formerly..... 410

1783

Situation: same items as last year..... 1,734,328

Extraordinary: same items as last year..... 1,425,227

Immigration and Indian Affairs: same items as last year, less the expense of making extra gifts to the Illinois Indians, as was done last year..... 968,241

1784

Situation: same items as last year..... 1,707,894

Extraordinary: items diminished by the cessation of extra expenditures of former years in Illinois and Natchez.... 951,065

Immigration and Indian Affairs: items as usual, but augmented by the expenditures connected with the celebration of the congress of Indians at Pensacola..... 1,586,917

1785

Situation: expenditures augmented by the increased number of employees in the departments of government in the capital and captured places, in the General Staff and other incidentals..... 2,341,752

Extraordinary: augmented by the extra expenses connected with the new expedition of Natchez, on receipt of reports of the arrival of American troops..... 1,987,352

Immigration and Indian Affairs: decreased by the giving of fewer gifts to the Indians..... 762,852

Total 37,398,051–10

The total outlay of the second decennial has amounted to thirty-seven million, three hundred and ninety-eight thousand, fifty-one *reales*, ten *maravedís* of silver [*plata fuerte*], which make four million, six hundred and seventy-four thousand, seven hundred and fifty-six *pesos*, three *reales*, and ten *maravedís*.

Josef [26] de Orue [rubric]
New Orleans, May 31, 1787.

[Accompanying, but apart from the above]

General Résumé in Silver Reales

First Decennial	10,512,120–12
Second Decennial	37,398,051–10
	47,910,171–22

Note: In the general résumé are included the total of the amounts drawn by this treasury upon those of Havana, Vera Cruz, and Mexico, with the sole exception of [payment for] five hundred *tercios* of flour and three hundred of *menestra* which were sent from Vera Cruz at the request of the Governor of this province.

Josef de Orue [rubric]
New Orleans, May 31, 1787.

[26] Here signed "Josef," but in the foregoing documents "Joseph."

BOOK REVIEWS

A world court in the light of the United States supreme court. By Thomas Willing Balch, L.H.D., Trinity college. (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane and Scott, 1918. 165 p. $2.00)

A distinct addition is made to the discussion of a world tribunal for the promotion of peace by Mr. Balch's book. After referring to the evident desire of advanced nations to avoid the consequences of war as evidenced by various provisions for arbitration, or by courts appointed *ad hoc* for the settlement of single cases, the author draws upon the experience of the United States supreme court for the purpose of considering the feasibility of a world court or tribunal.

It is shown that where the United States supreme court has dealt with cases between states in which the dispute involved only a small number of the states, or was of a *legal* as distinguished from a *political* nature, the court has been uniformly successful; but when a large number of the states were involved, and the question in dispute was of a political nature, such as the question of slavery out of which grew the famous Dred Scott case, the court failed and arms were resorted to.

In the light of this decision, the author asks the pointed question: "If the Supreme Court of the United States could not by a judgment avoid a civil war within the North American Union over a political question upon which the member states were divided into two fairly equal groups, is it likely that a Supreme Court of the World will by its judgment be able to compass in peace the political quarrels dividing the powers of the world into two fairly equal groups?" (p. 121)

Mr. Balch examines this inquiry with care, presents the considerations for its determination in a scholarly and judicial manner, and in a concluding note advises the reader that he began the present study "with the view of advancing an argument in favor of the early creation of a Supreme Court of the Nations as the best and easiest means of insuring peace between the members of the family of Nations." As the study advanced, however, he "was forced gradually to realize that there were limitations to the possibilities of securing world peace by the mere establishment of such a Tribunal." He nevertheless "believes that much can be done to make the recurrences of war less frequent."

The considerations which guide Mr. Balch to his somewhat pessimistic conclusions are mainly two: the susceptibilities of the judges, and the want of sanctions for the judgments of such a tribunal. In respect to

the first, one may question if the author has done complete justice to possible incumbents of such a court. It may be doubted if the circumstances which surrounded the Dred Scott decision would ever be paralleled, and it may be believed that the greater enlightenment of a more advanced civilization and the freer opportunity for the influence of public opinion has increased and will continue to increase the probability of unbiased judgment. There is, too, a widespread belief in a broadening of enlightened vision resultant upon the world war and its lessons.

With respect to the second consideration, the constitution of the league of nations which was formulated since Mr. Balch's book was written would seem to obviate the difficulty he feared. The moral suasion, the boycott, and the menace of concerted action by way of force in extreme cases would seem to meet the demand for power necessary to enforce the judgments of such a tribunal.

J. J. Thompson

A society of states. Sovereignty, independence and equality in a league of nations. By W. T. S. Stallybrass, M.A. (Oxon), fellow and vice-principal of Brasenose college, Oxford, of the Inner Temple, barrister at law. (New York: E. P. Dutton and company, 1919. 243 p. $2.00 net)

A republic of nations. A study of the organization of a federal league of nations. By Raleigh C. Minor, professor of constitutional and international law at the University of Virginia. (New York: Oxford university press, 1918. 316 p. $2.50 net)

The responsible state. A reëxamination of fundamental political doctrines in the light of world war and the menace of anarchism. By Franklin Henry Giddings, LL.D., professor of sociology and the history of civilization in Columbia university. (New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1918. 109 p. $1.00)

The people's part in peace. An inquiry into the basis for a sound internationalism. By Ordway Tead. (New York: Henry Holt and company, 1918. 156 p. $1.10 net)

The world war and leadership in a democracy. By Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., LL.D., professor of political economy in the University of Wisconsin. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 189 p. $1.50)

Democracy and world relations. By David Starr Jordan. (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World book company, 1918. 158 p. $1.20)

Among the numerous books dealing with international questions connected with the world war, the list here given is typical. While the volumes contain little of historical value they are in themselves important as definite *indicia* of one phase of public opinion at the conclusion of that struggle.

In *A society of states* Mr. Stallybrass discusses the formation of a league of nations in a very clear and sensible fashion. In any proposed plan knowledge of detail is necessary in addition to general enthusiasm. An enlightened public opinion is demanding some respite from war and its consequences, but those who seek a remedy must consider how it will limit the sovereignty of their own or other states. He shows that the union of civilized states need involve no great break with the past, and that the alternatives to such a union — world dominion on the part of a superstate, or a system of wholly sovereign independent states — have failed to preserve permanent peace. In fact, interdependence has to an increasing degree marked the relations of civilized nations with each other and a rule of law must supplant in still greater measure the rule of force. He shows the development of the idea of a league of nations, compares the framework of such a league with the constitution of the United States, and points out the essential features of some of the definite plans that were under consideration before the meeting of the peace conference. His discussion throughout is direct, simple, sane, and informing.

A republic of nations, by Mr. Minor, describes an international state rather than a mere league of nations. He points out the various causes of dispute between states and shows that not all are justiciable nor are nations always inclined to act with justice toward their fellows. Therefore such disputes as arise from the exercise of political powers by separate states must be eliminated by having the states give up those powers that are most prolific of trouble. He believes that this concession need extend little beyond yielding the control over commerce, the right to acquire territory by force, and the privilege of oppressing non-nationals. An arbitral court will not insure the settlement of quarrels between nations, for such a court is not created until after the dispute has begun, and the arbiters are inclined to take partisan positions. A full-fledged permanent judicial tribunal is impossible unless each nation concerned yields as a minimum the political powers indicated above. A mere league would affect the independence of the contracting nations, but not accomplish the full purpose of its creation. The international state, therefore, is the author's solution for permanent world peace. He not only discusses fully the separate departments and activities of his proposed international state, but compares his frame of government with the constitution of the United States. His methods are logical and he defends his position with ability, but the average reader will not be convinced that his scheme is practical. Nevertheless, it is well worth stating.

Mr. F. H. Giddings gave the Colver lectures at Brown university in 1918 and has published the results in a small volume, *The responsible*

state. He discusses the origin, powers, rights, and duties of a state. As a sociologist he traces each point from its primitive beginnings, but he tries to make his discussion practical. Few will dissent from his general views, although it is evident that many of his war-time utterances have already lost their force. He dissents from the concept of sovereignty as Teutonic philosophy interpreted it and emphasizes the necessity for toleration. Naturally he takes a forward look and premises that peace must be established on the basis of national justice; communities have the right to grow on equal terms; individuals may preserve their rights through protest, agitation, and persuasion; by means of this privilege minorities may convert their fellows and become majorities. He points out the difference between the militaristic spirit and the spirit that demands adequate preparation for national defense. Free peoples, he thinks, may accomplish more through spontaneous power than those who are the creatures of compulsion. The responsible state, he concludes, is composed of a politically-organized body of competent citizens. Few will dispute his major premises although they may not follow him into all the applications possible during a time of general warfare.

Mr. Ordway Tead devotes the chapters of *The people's part in peace* to a discussion of the economic foundations upon which a league of nations must be based. For this reason he favors a wider recognition of the labor elements than seemed possible a year ago. Recent events have shown the wisdom of his views.

Mr. Richard T. Ely's *The world war and leadership in democracy* is issued in the Citizen's library of which he is editor. The first five chapters touch upon the causes that brought the United States into the world war, while discussing the salient points of German development. In early American experience he notes a lack of emphasis upon leadership but an adherence to a belief in natural rights. Then the struggle for "equality of opportunity" became the dominant note in our national history. Mr. Ely interprets this as opportunity for the few as well as the many. Leadership, he finds, is developed in our colleges and universities, and he favors in them the fullest opportunity for all who are prepared to benefit by their instruction. Only in this way can we be sure that every potential leader obtains the opportunity that of right belongs to him. His historical illustrations, smacking of war-time flavor, are not always convincing.

Democracy and world relations, by Mr. David Starr Jordan, represents another phase of the same general discussion. Mr. Jordan does not worship democracy for itself, nor is he blind to its faults, yet he finds in its principles, rightly observed, the only enduring hope for future international relations. His democracy will cast aside traditional diplo-

macy, regulate national sovereignty, control commerce, and limit armaments. In the new community of states backward nations will be controlled in their own interest and in that of civilization, in the spirit of altruism rather than exploitation. The world policy of twelve months later still seems far removed from this ideal, but is progressing, let us hope, in that direction.

The force supreme. By Walter Wellman. (New York: George H. Doran company, [1918]. 191 p. $1.25 net)

This book deals with the type of world life and international relations which aims to do away with the old order and the conflicts and warfare which accompanied it. It it difficult to give a satisfactory and enlightening review of such a volume because the terms used by the author are, as a rule, rather general and vague, with a resulting uncertainty of meaning. Intermingled with phrases of doubtful content there are some concepts of value, though they could hardly be called original. The author believes that the world is an economic and social unit in which international coöperation should supersede war and coercion, and that this primary fact must govern the new world and its type of life in the future. A society of nations is to be the administrative director of this coöperative life. These fundamental premises are the basis of all the inferences and conclusions which are developed throughout the book. Among specific points advocated to maintain peaceful international relations are disarmament and the boycott or lockout, the latter to be used against aggressive military groups. These subjects are not discussed except in a general way so that one is left in doubt as to their exact value and limitations as methods.

The concluding chapters are devoted to the discussion of a covenant for world coöperation, conditions necessary for world peace, and the influence of President Wilson and Lloyd George in the formation of the new world order. These chapters are interesting in the light of the actual terms of the peace treaty and what has happened since the book was written. While the book may have some valuable suggestions for the general reader it is of little value to the scholar and careful student of world conditions.

James G. Stevens

The only possible peace. By Frederic C. Howe, Ph.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919. 265 p. $1.50 net)

The causes of the recent war are sketched out upon the basis of an economic interpretation of history which seems to be closely in line with the doctrines of Karl Marx. Thus the author lays the blame for the war mainly upon the banking and commercial classes of Germany in par-

ticular and of the world in general. He believes that the only peace that possibly can stand the test of time is one that is based upon a large measure of internationalism. The Mediterraneon and the near east must be placed under international control with a rather free disregard of those peculiar racial, geographical, religious, and temperamental interests that hitherto have been such potent forces in history.

The book shows signs of hasty writing and the style is very abrupt. The history of the past three or four decades is used as a mine for illustrative material for judgments that appear to have been predetermined. Mr. Howe finds that the munition makers of the world are the great enemies of right thinking when it comes to international questions and repeatedly states — as many as five times in one chapter — that they were a principal cause of the war. The book is decidedly of value as setting forth that view of history which is very popular just at present among a certain set of radical thinkers.

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Racial factors in democracy. By Philip Ainsworth Means. (Boston: Marshall/Jones company, 1918. 278 p. $2.50 net)

The author's review of the beginnings and development of culture is admirable. His characterization of the less-known ancient civilizations shows broad and accurate scholarship. His familiarity with achievements somewhat off the main line of cultural advance prompts him to champion "race appreciation," that is, the saving and absorbing into our civilization of the good portions of all native civilizations.

Along with much that is true and fine, however, he utters some nonsense. To declare that in governmental matters we are no better off than when magna charta was signed shows ignorance of history. His longing for the good old times in Japan reveals the sentimentalist and his picture of the Christian missionaries "knocking down the native establishments" is untrue. Contemporary movements such as bolshevism appear to him as the mutiny of the ignorant many against the guidance of the intelligent minority. Ignorant of modern economic history, he does not see that the class struggle today is not between rabble and elite but between workers and capitalists to determine what share of control and product shall go in virtue not of ownership but of labor.

The book demonstrates that acquaintance with the earlier cultures does not qualify one to solve the problems of contemporary society.

EDWARD A. ROSS

America at war. A handbook of patriotic education references. By Albert Bushnell Hart. [Patriotic publications of the National security league] (New York: George H. Doran company, 1918. 425 p.)

This manual is perhaps the most comprehensive and extensive of the many speakers' handbooks called into existence by the recent world war. It was "intended to aid speakers, writers, readers, and thinking people in general to visualize the present situation of the United States of America and to make the difficulties and dangers of the time clear to other people." It was also "intended to be something like the political campaign book to be carried in the pocket, read on the cars, and used as a source of arguments and discussions." It is, however, very different from the ordinary political campaign book in its careful preparation and scholarly character. The first edition appeared soon after the United States entered the war, and at a time when public opinion in this country was greatly confused. The manual aided, no doubt, in crystallizing public opinion and in mobilizing our vast resources for the war.

The book contains countless references to books and magazines, copies of important documents, a discussion of the immediate and remote causes of the war, an exposition of Germany's national ideals as well as methods of warfare, an orderly discussion of the steps and causes leading up to our action of April 6, 1917, as well as a discussion of world peace and world reorganization. In short, the volume is of permanent value and will have a distinct place in the literature of the war.

THOMAS F. MORAN

Development of the United States from colonies to a world power. By Max Farrand, professor of history, Yale university. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1918. 356 p. $1.50 net)

"A new interpretation of American History" — one "fundamentally different." The newness and the differences, apparently, are largely conceptions of the publishers. Mr. Farrand, however, has worthily performed a needed task in selecting from the enormous output of general histories and monographs certain topics that represent the more progressive methods of interpreting American history. He has made his selections with care and has presented them in a sprightly, suggestive manner.

From recent reviews as well as from personal examination, however, the reviewer feels that the anticipations aroused are only partially realized. In a work of this pretension the selection of topics is not a matter of mere personal choice. The author must have in mind the wishes and ideals of the people he represents and the need for information on the part of those for whom he writes. Most thoughtful readers will feel that

Mr. Farrand's presentation of American development is one-sided — scholarly and interesting withal, but disappointingly materialistic. Americans should prefer to invite foreign judgment upon a more idealistic program than is afforded by an almost exclusive consideration of free land, abundant staple commodities, a genius for mechanical invention and industrial combination, and similar agencies. These are determining factors in our development but they are not the only ones.

At the outset Columbus is relegated to the list of nonessential personages and the Spaniards are lightly left to the pursuit of precious metals. This need provoke no serious protest in so brief a volume; but when, in treating of English colonization in North America, the fisheries and the fur trade, land, labor, and commerce seem completely to dominate politics and social development, the thoughtful reader begins to question the author's viewpoint. These same factors, it appears, were largely instrumental in effecting political separation from the mother country and in assuring success to the subsequent experiments in national federation. In this result, better transportation facilities supplemented and superseded the national constitution. Our persistent neutrality during the Napoleonic struggle — prophetic of our more recent attitude — had an ample commercial basis. In the civil war superior resources gave victory to the north and the Atlanta exposition rather than the election of 1876 marked the turning point in reconstruction. The west grew with amazing rapidity but the industrial development of the rest of the country kept pace with it, while the people at large awakened only tardily to the necessity of breaking the power of special privilege.

A map of North America and one of the United States appropriately emphasize the materialistic content of the book. The suggestive chapter bibliographies, brief and frankly restricted to the author's personal library, admirably supplement an occasional telling quotation or explanatory footnote. The index is compact and accurate and a measure of what is omitted. In it appear the names of Eli Whitney and Samuel Slater, but not those of Lundy and Garrison. Free silver has its space but not the abolition movement. Charles Francis Adams, the railroad president, supersedes his father, the diplomat. Bunau-Varilla, as might be anticipated, replaces Balboa, but in bringing Panama up to date, why fail to mention Gorgas, Goethals, or even John Hay?

To base revolutionary grievances on the plaints of colonial swains represents an attempt to combine with brevity lightness, not to say levity. To this combination may be attributed the assumption that in the colonies the joint stock company overshadows the religious establishment; that the declaration of independence is primarily a partisan document; that sordidness characterizes the ordinance of 1787; and that commercialized

neutrality accounts for the success of Hamilton's nationalism. Many will commend, if they do not accept, the author's careful distinction between Washington as leader and as general, while they wholly approve his generous characterization of Lincoln. They will recognize with him that reconstruction involves the negro as laborer as well as citizen and appreciate the protection afforded by the fourteenth amendment alike to corporations and to freedmen. Sincere patriots who welcome every expression tending to promote greater cordiality among English-speaking peoples (not necessarily "Anglo-Saxon") will not seriously question a narrative that possibly errs in respect to justice toward England both through suppression and expression, but they will regret that a more complete attempt was not made to explain to these peoples our Pan-American policy.

Frequently the author is distressingly vague in his time factor — "when the time was ripe," "till very recently," and similar expressions. Too often he makes a downright mistake in date, or mixes up the time element of two events, for example, on pages 35, 39, 81, 101, 119, 142, 320. William Crawford came originally from Virginia (p. 155) but as a presidential candidate he was called a citizen of Georgia. There is confusion both in date and fact in regard to the right of deposit at New Orleans and the cession of Louisiana to France (pp. 100, 101). These are but a few of the minor slips in addition to those pointed out by other reviewers.

In such a book the mere criticism of minor errors is inadvisable, nor should one regret too keenly the abrupt dismissal of revolutionary philosophy or the failure to recognize the moral force of the antislavery movements. One must, however, attribute undue modesty or unusual self-restraint to an author whose past performances have led us to expect much, when he comes to discuss the constitutional convention. The readers of this magazine will welcome the treatment, well-proportioned within the limits he has set for himself, that he gives to frontier problems and those affecting the west. In view of his desire to explain the expansion of the United States and the establishment and maintenance of American democracy, he might have given more space to recent diplomacy. Because of the phases of our history that he has chosen to emphasize, he has not wholly pleased us at home, but he forces us to examine closely our previous conceptions; he does not interpret for our friends in Europe all that we hope our history means, but he pictures for them, more clearly than any other, some of its material aspects. For this we thank him, while we still await a more idealistic interpretation.

Isaac J. Cox

A history of the United States. By Cecil Chesterton. With an introduction by Gilbert K. Chesterton. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1919. 322 p. $2.50 net)

There is gratification in the fact that a skilful British writer has felt the need for a completer understanding of America and has tried to meet it. Mr. Chesterton's book is entertaining and informing — to its British readers. It would be ungracious for critical American historians to do more than indicate that the writer worked up his theme from a few standard sources in intervals between periods of military service, and that he does not pretend to have a thorough or detailed knowledge.

F. L. P.

The president's control of foreign relations. By Edward S. Corwin, Ph.D., professor of politics, Princeton university. (Princeton: Princeton university press, 1917. 211 p. $1.50 net)

This timely work is an analysis of the powers involved in handling foreign relations, and a study of the conflicts and agreements between the president, the senate, and the house as to their exercise. It is supported by a wealth of reference to debates, public discussions, acts, and particularly judicial decisions. The conclusions are admirably summarized in the last three pages of text, and the whole is made available by an excellent index.

It seems to the reviewer that Mr. Corwin should have devoted more space to the really complex question of treaties involving tariff provisions, and on page 45 he undoubtedly falls into the fallacy, so dangerous to one writing of present-day events, of presuming on the knowledge of his readers. Even now some of them will be uncertain as to whether the McLemore resolution was or was not passed. The book, however, shows clear thinking and scholarship and is a contribution to the discussion of the subject, while serving also as a convenient popular handbook.

Carl Russell Fish

Industry and trade. Historical and descriptive account of their development in the United States. By Avard Longley Bishop, professor of business administration in the Sheffield scientific school of Yale university, and Albert Galloway Keller, professor of the science of society in Yale university. (Boston: Ginn and company, 1918. 426 p. $1.32)

In this book are set forth a series of fundamental facts about the development and present status of the industrial and commercial life of the United States. It is, as the authors suggest, a perspective of the working life of the American people. Land and people as basic factors in industry; the agricultural, animal, mineral, and transportation indus-

tries; and the promotion of industrial life constitute the subject matter. In addition to a presentation of the representative industries, considerable attention is devoted to consideration of the methods and agencies of distribution. The authors are careful to make clear the intimate relation that obtains between industrial and commercial enterprise and the whole life of the nation. Throughout the discussion it is implied that economic and social institutions are not independent phenomena, and should not, therefore, be so treated. The text is supplemented with an excellent list of review questions based on the contents of each chapter.

The authors have succeeded admirably in giving a comprehensive historical survey of American industrial and commercial life. The book is, however, a general outline rather than an exhaustive presentation of that development. The most serious defect is the inadequate statistical comparison of present industrial and commercial conditions in the United States with those of foreign countries. While it may be claimed that such a comparison is not within the scope of this volume, nevertheless the student of industrial and commercial development usually deems it both necessary and expedient. The general statement that the United States leads the world in certain industries is insufficient unless reënforced with adequate statistical evidence. It would seem, also, that a complete presentation of the contemporary industrial and commercial status of the United States has been sacrificed to a discussion of the origin and development of industry and trade.

The book is written in a clear and interesting style, evidently designed as an elementary text for secondary schools. It is replete with pictorial illustrations and will prove a valuable supplement to the many texts already in the field. The general reader will find nowhere a more attractive review of American industrial and commercial development.

GORDON S. WATKINS

A social history of the American family. From colonial times to the present. Volume III: Since the civil war. By Arthur W. Calhoun, Ph.D. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark company, 1919. 411 p. $5.00 net)

The third volume of this valuable work plunges into the intricate and complex problems of the modern family — divorce, eugenics, child welfare, prostitution, falling birth rate, birth control, the entrance of women into industry, and other involved questions. The author shows that he comprehends the fundamental nature of the whole problem in his discussion of the industrial revolution which has so profoundly influenced the life of the family. The weakening of the legal, economic, and religious bonds of the marriage institution and family life is discussed as a step in

the evolution of the family toward a rationalized concept of relationship where equality, coöperation, and the mutual development of personality prevail. A fine perspective is shown in always treating the changes of family life as a part of a larger industrial and social evolution.

When the matter of foreshadowing the trend of the marriage institution and family organization is discussed the author points out that no definite forecasts can be made in regard to an institution which changes in response to the evolution of industrial technique and social life. Even in reference to the continuation of the monogamic family, which at present seems ideally suited to human needs, no definite prediction can be made. The forms of the family will change in accordance with needs as changes occur in the larger evolutionary life. A service has been performed in making it clear that the advocacy of any theories of family life ought not to disturb us unduly since family life does depend so largely upon economic organization and that changes will not be thrust upon us merely by reason of their being advocated.

Certain criticisms which were applicable to the first and second volumes are relevant here. The arrangement of the material leaves much to be desired in the way of clearness and logical unfolding. This fact, however, does not impair the very great value of a fundamentally scientific interpretation of family organization and evolution.

J. G. S.

Experts in city government. Edited by Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Ph.D. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1919. 363 p. $2.25 net)

This book is a collection of twenty-three articles by eighteen different writers, some of which have been previously published. About one-third of the articles deal with general municipal problems; another third more specifically with the need for experts, the extent of their present use, and conditions in the public service affecting their use; and the remainder with problems of training for the public service.

The articles vary a good deal in merit. One of the best is that by Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell on "The need for experts in city government." The arrangement does not always group together those most closely related, nor bring out a logical development of thought. Some important topics are given little attention. A good deal could be added about the actual working of existing civil service systems; and there is nothing about training schools for the police in some large American cities as well as in Europe.

In some of the articles on training, it seems to be assumed that a comparatively brief course combined with some practical work will qualify for the higher administrative posts. It should be more clearly recog-

nized that such positions can only be adequately filled after a long period of experience, in which administrative ability has an opportunity to develop.

J. A. F.

The quit-rent system in the American colonies. By Beverley W. Bond, Jr., associate professor of history in Purdue university. With an introduction by Charles M. Andrews. (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 492 p. $3.00)

To the large and ever increasing literature of American colonial history Mr. Bond has made a worthy addition. The quitrent had a place in the domain of real property in the colonies as important as the royal prerogative in matters of government and the navigation acts in matters of commerce. It was an effort to transfer to the new world an institution of England. It proved to be an obstacle before the people in their efforts to develop the resources of the country according to their own desires, and therefore has a larger significance than the petty details of the numerous quitrent controversies might seem to indicate. Many colonists to whom the royal prerogative was an indefinite principle and the navigation acts were a remote grievance found in the rents a source of constant irritation. Their pocketbooks were directly affected, their sense of justice was outraged, and their respect for government was lowered. Yet, except for a few chapters in rather technical works and discussions in monographs relating to the various colonies, the quitrent has not been treated. To bring together and organize the information disclosed in the material existing in this country and in England has been Mr. Bond's task. His work is notable for its excellent organization, its sane perspective, and its wise discrimination in handling the numerous controversies of the colonists over the rents. Mr. Andrews of Yale contributes an appreciative introduction and adds a few notes regarding the quitrent in New England outside of New Hampshire.

Mr. Bond's classification of colonies with respect to the quitrent is interesting. First, in chapter II he treats the colonies of New England in which the rents were not established. Then in chapters III and IV there follows a discussion of conditions in the colonies in which the rents were always strictly proprietary, although the government was royal. A third division is the rents in the proprietary colonies, subdivided into proprietaries surrendered to the crown and those which were not surrendered (chapters V-VII). Still another division of the work treats of the rents under royal administration (chapters VIII-XII). Chapter XII is a special treatment of the rents in the West Indian colonies, Nova Scotia, St. John, and the territory acquired in 1763.

From the multiplicity of details a few conclusions are noteworthy.

These may be classified according to the reaction of the colonists to the quitrent and the place of the rents in British administration. So far as the colonists were concerned, the rent system had one salutary effect: it served to check land speculation, an evil less apparent in Maryland and Virginia, where the rents were well established, than in those colonies in which they were not well established. The contrast between royal and proprietary rents is also notable, for the proprietors enforced a higher rate than did the crown. Yet when the crown assumed control a disinclination to accommodate a strictly legal view of the rents and the obligations arising from them to frontier conditions caused antagonism to continue. The result was an inflammatory state of mind which was an excellent background for the agitation of the revolution.

The British administration of the quitrents is ably surveyed separately in chapter XIV. The evils of the split executive, so notable in commercial and political policy, were ever present. The auditor-general, resident in England, was subject to directions from the lord high treasurer, the first lord of the treasury, and the chancellor of the exchequer. The receivers-general, resident in the colonies, were appointed by the crown, but there were also deputies appointed by the auditor-general. Moreover, the royal governors had an influence and the coöperation of the assemblies was much to be desired. Under such conditions financial efficiency was hardly to be expected; the collections were about one-half the amount called for by the rent rolls. Efficiency also varied from colony to colony. Toward the close of the colonial period the British authorities took more interest in the rent problem. The possibility of procuring from the rents sufficient revenue to pay the cost of administration within the colonies was realized, and if the revolution had not intervened the remaining proprietary charters would doubtless have been revoked, if for no other reason than to secure the revenue from the rents enjoyed by the proprietors.

WILLIAM K. BOYD

The North West company. By Gordon Charles Davidson, Ph.D. (Berkeley: University of California press, 1918. 349 p. $3.00 bound; $2.50 paper)

So few books of real worth have been written concerning the fur trade of North America that the appearance of a new volume in this field may be regarded as an event, particularly when it deals with so important and little-known a phase of the subject as the history of the North West company. Mr. Davidson's volume is the most pretentious study of the sort which has appeared since the publication of Chittenden's *American fur trade of the far west.* An examination of the bibliography reveals that the writer has searched the field with the most painstaking care in

an effort to obtain all the material available. He has personally investigated the principal British and Canadian archives and has brought to light considerable manuscript and some printed material which has never before been used. After studying the bibliography, however, one can not but be impressed by the scarcity of information which is available concerning the business operations of the North West company. There is very little material in the form of accounts and other business papers which throws light upon the history of the concern as an economic enterprise. There is likewise an almost entire absence of correspondence or letter books of the partners of the concern, which if available would be of the utmost value. The various agreements between the partners which formed the basis of the organization of the company at various times have been preserved and likewise copies of the journals kept by the *bourgeois*. The latter, however, are for the most part concerned with descriptions of the country in the interior and contain all too little information concerning the conduct of the business. In making any critical estimate of Mr. Davidson's work, then, it must be constantly borne in mind that he has been greatly handicapped owing to the fact that the records of the North West company itself have not been obtainable. After all is said, one can not but feel satisfied that the volume contains nearly all of the available facts concerning the history of the company, from its origin in the latter part of the eighteenth century down through the turbulent years of strife with rival fur companies and Lord Selkirk and the Red River colony, until its absorption by the Hudson's Bay company in 1821. There is one valuable manuscript, however, which the writer does not mention. It is in the form of a folio of some eighty closely-written pages and is preserved in the Baby collection at the Bibliothèque St. Sulpice, Montreal. This folio contains the minutes of meetings of the North West partners held at Grand Portage and later at Kamanistiquia between the years 1801 and 1806. These minutes, which have never been published, contain a great deal of information relative to the administration of the departments in the interior, the allotment of shares, and negotiations with the Hudson's Bay, Michillimackinac, and American fur companies, while they also throw interesting sidelights upon the life of the interior. In some respects they constitute as valuable a source as any which the author has used.

After due allowance has been made for the scarcity of material, however, Mr. Davidson's treatment of his subject leaves much to be desired. First of all, his method is extremely labored and the reader cannot avoid a feeling that the author has been obsessed with the fear of omitting a single fact regardless of how essential it may be for the purpose of explaining what the North West company was and how it conducted its

operations. The outlines of the story are obscured by the mass of detail which, if necessary at all, should have been relegated to the footnotes — although they are already overburdened — or to one of the nineteen appendices. In the first chapter, for example, several pages are devoted to recounting the number of cannon, men, and fusils, the number of gallons of rum, the pounds of gunpowder, and hundredweight of shot for which trade licenses were issued to several firms covering a period of a number of years. The average reader will certainly agree with the author that "the enumeration may be tedious" and while he will not categorically deny that "the showing is interesting and significant," he would be pleased to have a more adequate explanation as to why the latter assertion is true.

The narratives of the explorations of Alexander Mackenzie, Peter Pond, David Thompson, Alexander Henry, and others, which occupy a considerable portion of the book, are also rather tiresome. It is doubtful in the first place whether so detailed an account of their activities is necessary, for although interesting enough to a student of the history of geographical discovery, it adds little to our knowledge of the North West company. The story of these discoveries is for the most part merely a repetition of the narratives contained in the journals and memoirs of the explorers themselves. Mr. Davidson's account gives but little new information and it lacks the freshness of the originals from which it is derived.

Probably the most valuable chapter of the book is the one entitled "Trade and trading methods." The business practices of the company are described with as much fullness as the scarcity of the materials will allow and there is also a good deal of valuable data concerning the external features of the trade, including personnel, the kind of goods used, methods of transportation, and the like. The chapter contains a wealth of information which no future student of the fur trade can afford to ignore. But here again the author frequently lapses into an encyclopedic enumeration of facts.

The writer was in France when the volume was published and so can not be held accountable for any editorial shortcomings. Perhaps this fact will explain why within the space of six pages there are three different spellings for what is presumably the same geographical name: Gamanistikouia, Kaministiquia, and Kaministikwia, none of which appear in quotation marks.

It is in method of treatment and interpretation that the *North West company* leaves most to be desired and it is believed that even the most conscientious reader will lay the book down at the end with a hazy idea as to what the company really was, how it functioned, and what its sig-

nificance for the history of the Great lakes region and the Canadian northwest. The essential facts have all been given, and the author deserves due credit for the painstaking and industrious manner in which he has carried on his researches. But the reader must correlate the facts and interpret them for himself. This method of treatment, while similar to that of many other monographic studies, is as far removed as possible from that of the brilliantly suggestive study of the early fur trade by Charles H. McIlwain, in his introduction to Wraxall's *Abridgement of the Indian affairs*. Mr. McIlwain's study reveals what it is possible to do in a field similar to that in which Mr. Davidson has been working.

WAYNE E. STEVENS

Political history of the public lands, 1840-1862. From preëmption to homestead. By George M. Stephenson, Ph.D., instructor in history, Dartmouth college. (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1917. 296 p. $2.50 net)

It is encouraging to note a growing interest in the study of American public land history. The public domain has been one of the dominant forces in American history. It has been the subject of sectional controversy engaging the attention of political parties and party leaders and having a determining influence on elections and on the general course of legislation. The continued presence of free land has enabled the government to encourage immigration on an unprecedented scale, to promote internal improvements and railway building, and to foster education. It has nurtured individualism to an extent unknown in any other country. It is indeed impossible to give proper consideration to any phase of our history: economic, political, constitutional, social, religious, or æsthetic, without due recognition of the influence of the public lands. Yet it is only within recent years that the importance of this subject has been recognized. As a result, a number of researches into the field of public land history have been made and a few good monographic studies and articles have been published. Of these studies, in the reviewer's opinion, that by Mr. Stephenson is the best from the standpoint of both historical scholarship and literary presentation.

Mr. Stephenson has defined his problem as first, "to trace the history of the public land legislation in Congress"; second, "to portray the sentiment of the different sections of the country relative to the disposal of the public lands on the political and legislative situation in general in the period from 1840-1862." He presents "the fact of sectional rivalries and combinations" as his main thesis. The northwest wanted low priced lands, a low tariff, and internal improvements; the north Atlantic states wanted a high tariff, high priced lands, and internal improvements; and finally, the south Atlantic states wanted a low tariff, no

internal improvements at federal expense, and high priced public lands. Mr. Stephenson shows how these sectional rivalries developed into a bid on the part of New England and the South for western support, and how this sectional bickering culminated in a triangular contest over the public lands, which may be described as "the preëmption-distribution-cession controversy." The west favored a liberal land policy supporting preëmption: the right of first purchase at the minimum price of $1.25 an acre, coupled with graduation of the price of unsold lands. New England opposed preëmption and graduation fearing that the system would withdraw too many laborers from her manufacturing centers. But since her primary interest was a high protective tariff, and the revenues from the sales of public lands were contributing to the piling up of a federal surplus, she was willing to compromise her difficulty by conceding distribution of the proceeds of the sales of public lands among the states in proportion to their representation in congress, in order to enable her to maintain protection by the aid of western votes. The south was opposed to both the high tariff and a liberal land policy, but in order to win western support in favor of a low tariff she came out under the leadership of Calhoun in favor of cessions of the public lands to the states in which they were located, thereby hoping to make a successful bid for western support against New England. The growth of these "sectional rivalries and combinations" are reviewed in the first six chapters by Mr. Stephenson with clearness and force, supported with a weight of evidence from congressional speeches and documents and representative newspapers of the country.

The remaining nine chapters of the monograph are devoted to a treatment of the homestead movement. The west has always held to the tenet that the public lands belong to the people and that they should be free to actual settlers on the ground that the hardships and sacrifices undergone in bringing them under cultivation constituted a sufficient payment. Free homesteads, however, were delayed until 1862, chiefly because of the opposition of the east, which regarded the public lands as worth any price that they would bring, and which further regarded the rapid settlement of the west as neither probable nor desirable. Mr. Stephenson traces the earlier beginnings of the national homestead agitation and legislation; the relation of the homestead question to other land questions, such as bounties, grants for various purposes, and graduation; and the political and legislative history of homesteads from 1844 to 1852. He analyzes the attitude of the sections toward the homestead bill of 1852 and the struggle between slavery and free lands. The importance of the homestead issue in the campaign of 1860 is the subject of a chapter of unusual interest. The last chapter deals with the enact-

ment of the homestead measure of 1862. The volume is concluded by a brief retrospect which summarizes the whole period from 1840 to 1862.

Mr. Stephenson's study is a noteworthy contribution to the history of the period. Deficiencies of course will readily occur to the critical student, but on the whole the work has been well done. It is to be hoped that similar studies of the period from 1862 to 1890 will soon be undertaken.

The text is provided with an excellent analytical table of contents, copious footnotes, an extensive classified bibliography, and a useful index. It is printed on good paper and bound in neat and attractive form.

LOUIS BERNARD SCHMIDT

The anti-slavery crusade. A chronicle of the gathering storm. By Jesse Macy. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 245 p. $3.50)

Here is a retelling of an old story, a story which gains in effect from its isolation and separation from the political chronology of the period. The two phases of the antislavery movement are analyzed with a recognition of their relations to the armed strife that followed. The early phase showed in every state and in every section and among all classes of the white population a humanitarian acknowledgment of the desirability of restoring freedom to the negro slaves. The early crusaders found their efforts received with respect and consideration, though the institution of slavery spread in spite of their efforts. In the early thirties, however, the sectional character of the crusade became increasingly apparent and the conservative forces in the north rallied to the support of the property rights of the slaveholder. Good society bitterly denounced the agitators. Even the churches proved pliable tools of the proslavery forces. "Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, the right of assembly, trial by jury, the right of petition, free use of the mails, and numerous other fundamental human rights were assailed" (p. 67). "The ruling classes resorted to mob violence," but in the south repressive legislation supplemented by social and religious ostracism enabled the proslavery element to dominate the situation and to leave the field of mob action chiefly to their northern allies. What were the fruits of repression and denial of civil liberties? Those who opposed mob violence, together with those who defended the fundamental rights of freemen, were almost inevitably drawn into a more or less active part in the antislavery crusade.

When the author takes up the political narrative at the crisis of 1850, it is refreshing to find that the brief chapter on the "Passing of the whig party" avoids the usual inaccurate reference to *the compromise* of 1850; the attempt in the same chapter to explain the election of 1852

is inadequate and unsatisfactory. In the chronological narrative that follows Mr. Macy concentrates an undue amount of attention on the struggle for Kansas, with the result that the origin and development of the republican party are sadly neglected. One unique feature of the synthesis of the volume is the emphasis upon John Quincy Adams and, more particularly, upon Charles Sumner as the protagonists of the antislavery cause in congress. One's inclination to accept this choice of Sumner over Seward does not prevent a doubt as to the desirability of devoting over sixteen pages of so small a volume to Sumner to the neglect of an adequate estimate of Seward and Lincoln. To John Brown, the martyr-crusader, is given the last chapter of the volume. The author repeatedly admits that "Brown's contribution to Kansas history has been distorted beyond all recognition" (p. 231; see also p. 214), yet he himself devotes as much space to Brown's Kansas exploits as he does to the more important Harper's Ferry incident. The volume seems to evidence the fact that where the author has departed from the proportions usually assigned to the various items, he has done so with a knowledge of the fact and willingness to take the consequences for the freshness of the synthesis that is produced. It should also be noted that the treatment breaks from the traditional emphasis upon the New England influence in the antislavery movement, and gives the western aspect a more adequate consideration.

Throughout the volume Mr. Macy evidences a definite sympathy for the antislavery crusaders. More than this, he regards the slavery controversy as part of "the irrepressible conflict between liberty and despotism which has persisted in all ages" (p. 13). His conclusion is that the antislavery movement exemplifies "the most difficult lesson which history teaches: that slavery and despotism are themselves forms of war, that the shedding of blood is likely to continue so long as the rich, the strong, the educated, or the efficient, strive to force their will upon the poor, the weak, and the ignorant" (p. 232).

ARTHUR C. COLE

The boss and the machine. A chronicle of the politicians and party organization. By Samuel P. Orth. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 203 p. $3.50)

This volume is a brief treatment of a large subject. Brief as it is, its contents are of a wider range than a literal interpretation of the title might suggest, for the first chapter sketches the history of parties to 1860 and chapter eight describes the place of congress and the president in political action. On the whole, the proportion between matters primarily historical and those chiefly in the domain of political science is well chosen. Five chapters (III-VII) deal with the more notorious epi-

sodes in the rôle of the bosses in congressional, state, and municipal affairs since the close of the civil war; the three last chapters (IX-XI) describe the efforts to deprive the bosses of their political power through movements for reforms in the civil service, the ballot, legislation, city administration, and control of party organization. The underlying theme is the opportunity for organized corruption in the demand of business interests for aid and stimulus by the government and the consequent necessity, as a means of protecting the public, of extending state control over that which was originally a private concern, party organization.

To the vast subject treated there is no effort to add new information or a new perspective. The indebtedness to the larger and also the more technical works relating to American history and various phases of American government and politics is apparent. But as a brief and ably-written summary, well suited to introduce the average citizen to the larger phases of political mechanism in the past and at the present time, the book should be useful. The bibliography, which is brief, does not list histories, autobiographies, and many biographies which contain material relating to party history, party organization, and the methods of bosses. Even more singular is the omission of the important guide books so essential for any extensive reading or investigation in the field of American politics. The press work, the binding, and the eight full-page illustrations are of the high quality characteristic of the other volumes in the series already published.

WILLIAM K. BOYD

Washington. The man who made us. A ballad play by Percy MacKaye. With scene designs by Robert Edmond Jones. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1919. 313 p. $1.75 net)

The portrayal of *the real* George Washington, "magnetic, resourceful, patient," in place of the statuesque, almost mythical character of the early biographers is worthy of commendation. There can be little criticism of the play from the viewpoint of the historian, for the author acknowledges that there are minor inconsistencies in time and place. This "ballad play probably the first of its kind," has two versions, the "theatre version" and the "festival version." The latter or unabridged form is designed for what the writer styles the community drama, or the theatre of tomorrow. For "festival theatre" purposes, one hundred participants are presumed to represent the one hundred speaking characters, whereas the several rôles may be taken by fewer than one third that number of professionals. In general, Washington the surveyor, farmer, and soldier under Braddock, the early revolution including the crossing of the Delaware, and from Valley Forge to the close of the revo-

lution, constitute the main themes for the three acts. The ballad forms of the period have been drawn on freely in the "transitions" and make a pleasing contribution to the entire movement.

President Wilson. By Daniel Halévy. Translated from the French by Hugh Stokes. (New York: John Lane company, 1919. 283 p. $1.50 net)

Not a biography in the ordinarily accepted sense, nor yet merely an interpretative essay, this volume is an attempt to combine the two, special emphasis, however, being laid upon the thought of Mr. Wilson rather than on the facts of his life. It is interesting chiefly as one of the attempts to reveal to France and to Europe the thought and purpose of the president in meeting the various problems which have come before him for solution. In the point of view of the author rests the chief value of the study, since otherwise it contains practically nothing that is new. It is at best a rather superficial study by one who shows in many ways a rather striking unfamiliarity with American institutions, problems, and thought. Some of the authorities relied on for expression of American opinion and sentiment might lead to the belief that he is equally unfamiliar with American thinkers.

It is doubtful if many Americans will agree with the author that Mr. Wilson has in later life subordinated the executive to the legislative branch of the United States government (p. 23). Mr. Wilson himself would scarcely admit that his purpose in writing *Congressional government* was "to demonstrate that the idea of the American Constitution is false, and that its results are absurd" (p. 27). The average American at least is unaware that this immense nation of mixed race is composed of illiterates, streaked with Calabrian, Syrian, and Croat blood (p. 102). The republic of Colombia in all probability is still as ignorant as the United States of the startling fact that President Wilson in a lordly fashion ended her claims against us by a "gift" of twenty-five millions of dollars (p. 156).

The translation, if designed to be literal both as to the nervous style and French method of expression, is highly successful; but better results would have been obtained had there been less frequent use of such words as "magistrature," "candidature," "tentatives," "autonomist," and a host of others. One wonders also why "Progressist" is uniformly employed for "Progressive."

J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton

Dutch and English on the Hudson. A chronicle of colonial New York. By Maud Wilder Goodwin. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 243 p. $3.50)

The Chronicles of America in their artistic bindings, with their fine quality of paper, readable type, and well-chosen, beautifully-executed illustrations, at once attract the lover of good books. Certainly every author in the series is, as it were, "well introduced." Maud Wilder Goodwin in her volume on *Dutch and English on the Hudson* presents a very readable sketch of New Netherland and colonial New York. Although not based on an exhaustive, intimate knowledge of the sources of New York history, the volume shows that the author has well assimilated the main facts in the early history of the empire state, while an illuminating imagination and a command of good English enable her to tell the story to good effect. A little more than one half of the book is devoted to the Dutch period, the remainder carrying the narrative to the outbreak of the revolution.

The first two chapters are devoted to the voyage of Hudson and the ventures of the early traders and settlers; another chapter tells the story of the patroons, while the general social and economic life of the Dutch colony is described mainly in the two chapters on "Domines and school teachers" and "The burghers." In the English period more particular attention is given to Jacob Leisler, Captain Kidd and the pirates, Peter Zenger, the negro plots, and Sir William Johnson. The author objects to the emphasis which has been placed upon the "purely commercial" nature of Dutch colonization in America and believes that "in reality the founding of New Netherland marked a momentous epoch in the struggle for the freedom of conscience." If a mistake has been made in the commonly accepted theory that the commercial motive was the chief incentive for the original founding and settlement of the Dutch colony on the Hudson, Mrs. Goodwin hardly justifies any different view by the facts or arguments which she presents in the chapter on "Domines and school teachers." Most of the chapter concerns itself with the religious persecutions under Stuyvesant, the poor ability of the early schoolmasters and the discouraging conditions under which they had to work. Without question New Netherland allowed, comparatively speaking, a large measure of toleration, but it will take much ingenious explaining to demonstrate that any other motive predominated over trade and profit in the founding of the colony.

C. H. Rammelkamp

The cotton kingdom. A chronicle of the old south. By William E. Dodd. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 161 p. $3.50)

Here is a masterful sketch in a few clear bold strokes of a régime that to this day enjoys understanding among few persons, whether northerners or southerners. Mr. Dodd's gift is to present the forces at work with a suggestion of their larger relationship to the corresponding forces of today. There is a real message for the wide circle of readers whose attention this historical series challenges.

Mr. Dodd is fortunate in being able to dispatch his obligations to chronological narrative in a final chapter on the planter in politics, which covers the decade 1850-1860. He begins his essay with a description of "The lower south in 1850" and an interpretation of the forces — political, economic, and social — that entered into its make-up. He summarizes the early democratizing influence of the frontier in order to be able to reveal at a later point how much the cotton kingdom demanded in sacrifices upon its altar. The student of the frontier can appreciate the significance of the statement which Mr. Dodd submits as his key to the social and moral complex of the section: "The lower South had been and still was an outwardly irreligious, dram-drinking, and dueling section"; — it is more than a spicy offering to stimulate one's appetite for the facts that follow. A chapter on "The rise of the cotton magnates" explains the concentration of wealth in the form of land and slaves in the hands of the planting aristocracy — the profits of the southern plantations and of southern slavery, however, went to the northern merchants who supplied the planters with their needs. "Two-thirds of the white population of the South had no connection with the institution of slavery" (p. 24), but all for good and sufficient reasons contributed to the power of the industrial leaders. In the course of time the cotton planters found spokesmen bold enough to reject "the equalitarian teachings which had underlain the politics of the South since 1800" and to formulate a theory to justify the rapid stratification of southern society. Upon this was built the life and literature, the organized religious and educational institutions of the planting states, and the political power of the cotton kingdom, firmly lodged in an oligarchy which controlled every phase of life in the south and for a time the political destinies of the nation.

The story, told as Mr. Dodd tells it, is a tale of revolution of a peaceful, subtle, and insinuating brand. A few deft touches reveal the process by which the various religious organizations of the south became the bulwarks of the institution of slavery and found their reward in a prosperous growth. The aristocratic Episcopalian church had spoken

from the start as a society of gentlemen and in time the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist denominations gave up the philosophy of the declaration of independence for the inspired biblical defense of slavery. Another hidden tragedy, closely connected with the religious development, is revealed in the educational progress made in the south. Jefferson, in a period with a strong deistic trend, had founded the University of Virginia with the intention that no religious creed should get a hearing there; but in the course of time "the growing religious conservatism of the Virginian compelled the new University to take to its bosom the representatives of the leading churches as guides and monitors of its students" (p. 98). Why? Because the church, proclaiming the bible as the arsenal from which the best proslavery arguments were drawn, now found the southerners ready to abandon an earlier tendency toward agnosticism for the doctrine of the total and absolute inspiration of the bible. When it was realized that it was the providential trust of the southern people to conserve and perpetuate the institution of domestic slavery as then existing (p. 109), the school joined the pulpit in preaching this gospel of the kingdom of cotton and waxed prosperous and contented. Lest the author might seem to have been carried on by empty theorizing, attention should be called to the statistical data which he submits to show how the south in the decade between 1850 and 1860 outstripped New England and all her traditions of educational aggressiveness (pp. 111-112). These are cold facts seldom noticed by students of educational history and they have a significance for the educational world of today.

The slaveholders inevitably replied to critics like Macaulay, Dickens, Mrs. Trollope, and Harriet Martineau that modern industrialism was worse than slavery. To the business men of the north, however, they pointed out a common cause and prophesied that their northern allies would one day regret that they had not extended a more enthusiastic support to the peculiar institution of the south. In due time the significance of this warning was realized in the threat of the awakening democracy of the north. Then, too late, August Belmont, Tammany Hall, and their kind rushed forward with offers of assistance and money for southern defense in the political arena. The cotton kingdom had mobilized all its forces but a huge democratic crusading spirit crushed all before it and amid the crash its northern allies sought cover for themselves. And the average reconstructed rebel of today rejoices that the slave power has found a satisfactory successor in modern capitalism.

A. C. C.

Historical geography of Detroit. By Almon Ernest Parkins, Ph.D. (Lansing: Michigan historical commission, 1918. 356 p. $1.00)

In this book Mr. Parkins describes a century of growth in Detroit, 1810 to 1910, with emphasis on economic phases and especially upon the influence of geographic environment. Indicating the influence of the topography, the waterways, the soil, the climate, mineral resources, plant life, animal life, and aboriginal human life upon the activities of the white settlers of Michigan's metropolis, he has also traced the general progress of the surrounding region through the various stages of lumbering, agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing. The work will prove specially interesting to the business man and student of economic history in its story of the rise of manufactures in a great city, in the evolution of Detroit's outlet to the ocean, and the development of land transportation from the dirt road to the modern steam and electric lines.

The method is more that of the historian than of the geographer. While the material is woven about the geographic element of the environment, its arrangement is chronological, and the treatment follows the most modern conception of that interesting field which borders both geography and history. An extensive bibliography is given in the book, consisting of original documents, manuscripts, papers, journals, reports, and accredited secondary materials. The illustrations are well chosen, and there is a useful index.

GEORGE N. FULLER

Legal and political status of women in Iowa. An historical account of the rights of women in Iowa from 1838 to 1918. By Ruth A. Gallaher. (Iowa City, Iowa: The State historical society of Iowa, 1918. 300 p. $2.50)

It is important that studies similar to this account of the legal and political status of women be made in the various states and with regard to all the important aspects of social organization. The experience of the war has shown how essentially common the great concerns of life are to the people of the whole country, and how necessary it is that certain elementary features of democratic organization should be incorporated in our governmental institutions. Among these items, in a minimum program of democracy, is the equal opportunity for women with men to make their contribution to the community life. Since under the English institutions from which American institutions are so largely derived, women were excluded from the practice of virtually all the higher professions, since in marriage they lost their legal competence as individuals and gained no new competence as members of the family groups; and since, when wage-earners, their wages belonged to their husbands, the adoption of a liberal policy giving to the various groups of women

the necessary equality of opportunity means complete legislative revision of the common law governing the position of women in their relations to husband and children, in their professional opportunity, in their industrial relationship, and in their political status.

Such legislative changes will occur in the different states in accordance with the special interests of the women of the state, but, in general, the barbarity of the common law of coverture has been recognized in all the states at a reasonably early period, when the principles of the equity treatment of married women have been embodied in legislation.

Miss Gallaher has confined her study to the civil and political status of women and has devoted a chapter each to the common law, the early status of women in Iowa, personal rights of women, women in education, women and the professions, women and the common law marriage and divorce, guardianship of children, property rights of women, women in industry, equal suffrage in the United States, equal suffrage in Iowa, 1838-1865, equal suffrage in Iowa, 1865-1890, equal suffrage in Iowa, 1890-1918, women in appointive offices in Iowa, and women in elective offices in Iowa.

The sources used are the session laws and codes of Iowa, the reports of the Iowa supreme court and certain other official documents to which accurate reference is made. The material is very carefully and honestly presented and no sign of sex antagonism appears. The effort to secure an enlargement of the rights of women is made to appear, as it should appear, as a development in democratic organization rather than as the result of sex bitterness.

The study is especially interesting because Iowa has on the whole presented the liberal development to be expected in a prosperous community in which there have developed no great industrial interests concerned to keep down the bargaining power of women, nor any large aristocracy governed by the motives of the leisure class. What has come about has been the recognition of the civil rights of women and the imposition of the appropriate duties upon women. If the study is weak at any point, it is in full appreciation of the common law. For example, in the explanation of the meaning of the pretty word "curtesy," which denoted the husband's right to his wife's real property in case he survived her, Miss Gallaher has only Blackstone's explanation of the husband's doing service at the lord's court. She misses the later students' explanation that the English law was more "courteous" to the husband than was either the law of Normandy or of Scotland. (See Pollock and Maitland, *History of the English law*, 2: ch. 7.) And so she fails to bring out the fact that under the common law, the duty of the husband to support his wife under the doctrine of "Necessaries" was unenforceable and there

was no duty to support his child other than that imposed by the poor law of Elizabeth. (Garnett, *Children and the law*, p. 2.) The Iowa statute gives to women legal competence and lays on the wife, with the husband, the duty of meeting family expenses. The change brought about in the position of the husband by this one clause is almost as great as that brought about in the position of the wife and while the separate existence of the woman is recognized, the unity of the family receives recognition equally effective.

In the opinion of the reviewer, another arrangement of topics would have simplified the presentation of the material, as the problems of educational and professional limitations have little or nothing to do with the doctrine of coverture, while it is impossible to discuss the personal rights of women without introducing that doctrine. It would therefore have been easier to follow if the discussion in chapters 3 and 4 had preceded that in chapter 2 and if all the topics in which marriage is a factor had been brought together. This is a question of judgment, however, and the study is so intelligently and dispassionately presented that criticism on this point may well seem carping.

S. P. Breckinridge

A study of state aid to public schools in Minnesota. By Raymond Asa Kent, Ph.D., sometime assistant professor of education in the University of Minnesota. [Studies in the social sciences, number 14] (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1918. 183 p. $1.00)

In his study of state aid in Minnesota, Mr. Kent makes available to students of education the data and the method upon which the public education commission, created in 1913, and of which he was secretary, based its conclusions and recommendations.

There are two forms of state aid in Minnesota: the current school fund, distributed to all schools on the basis of the number of children attending forty days or more; and special aid distributed on the basis of classification of schools and departments. It is with the problem of the special aid that Mr. Kent deals. The nature of his study can be indicated most concisely by the titles of his chapters: "The problem," "Historical summary of legislation affecting state aid," "Special aid to high schools," "Special aid to graded schools," "Special aid to rural schools," "Special aid to high, graded, and rural schools compared," "Special aid to industrial departments," with a final chapter of "Conclusions." The text is interspersed with seventy-six tables and followed by four appendices and bibliography.

A serious defect in form is the lack of an index. Furthermore, a fuller interpretation of several of the tables would have been desirable. Mr. Kent, however, has organized his data and presented his conclusions

in a scholarly and convincing fashion. His study is an exceedingly painstaking, valuable, and significant contribution to the all-important and thus far very inadequately treated subject of school finance.

FLETCHER HARPER SWIFT

The Union colony at Greeley, Colorado, 1869-1871. Edited by James F. Willard, Ph.D., professor of history in the University of Colorado. [University of Colorado historical collections, Colonial series I] (Boulder, 1918. 412 p. $3.00)

"With the present volume the University of Colorado begins the publication of documents and other material primarily relating to the history of Colorado. It is proposed to issue similar volumes at frequent intervals in the future. After the colony series is completed, other subjects falling within the period before Colorado became a state will be dealt with. In every instance an attempt will be made to publish all the pertinent historical documents that can be found and that are not easily accessible elsewhere." Thus Mr. Willard introduces what promises to be an admirable collection of the sources of Colorado history —a collection which no serious student of the far west will wish to overlook.

The volume at hand deals with the establishment of the community or "colony" at Greeley, and the first year and a half of its history. The great distance to the far west, the enduring dread of the Indians, the cut rates which an association of emigrants could command from the railways, the advantage of coöperation in such undertakings as the purchase of land and the digging of irrigation ditches — these and other considerations weighed heavily in favor of migration by groups. Of all the groups of colonists to come to Colorado perhaps the most successful was the Union colony at Greeley. The association was organized in New York, December 23, 1869, and with the helpful support of Horace Greeley in the *New York Tribune* succeeded in settling colonists upon the chosen site as early as April of the following year. The early history of this project is well set forth in the documents selected by Mr. Willard for publication. About one-third of the volume is devoted to the printing of "Minutes" of the initial meeting of the Union colony association, and of the board of trustees and executive committee which later took charge. Some of these documents are obtained from manuscript sources; others are reprinted from Greeley's *Tribune*. Forty-five pages more are used to reproduce the "Financial records" of the colony — cashbook, journal, and ledger. Under the title "Circulars" the constitution of the colony and other interesting documents appear. Then follow "Lists of members," "Miscellaneous documents," "Private correspondence,"

"Excerpts from Colorado newspapers," a "List of documents and newspapers," and a comprehensive index.

An introduction, commendably brief, summarizes the history of the colony in a fairly satisfactory fashion, although in punctuation and in manner of expression one is surprised to find here almost as great a degree of uncertainty as in some of the documents that follow. For example, a careful writer would hardly say that the "migration of farmers was also hindered by the ignorance of the methods of irrigation that prevailed in the eastern states," or that "it was agreed to hold an election, in which the colonists present should participate, of an executive committee of nine."

JOHN D. HICKS

History of the state of Idaho. By C. J. Brosnan, superintendent of public schools, Nampa, Idaho. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. 237 p. $1.00)

This book is an elementary narrative of the most significant and most interesting facts of Idaho history. The language is clear and simple and the story runs along with topic after topic receiving equal attention. At regular intervals are inserted short statements explaining some one of the many attractions of Idaho.

There are chapters on physiography, the Indians, the acquisition of Oregon, Lewis and Clark, the fur traders, "Western trails," missionaries, and mining. These chapters, which constitute the best part of the book, are brief sketches of many topics, but the subjects are generally treated with fairness and judgment. There is some repetition. The construction of Fort Boise, for instance, is described twice (pp. 45 and 59). The long description of the Santa Fe trail (pp. 62, 63) does not help in describing trails in Idaho. There appear to be no mistakes of fact though frequently the statements are so general that they become vague.

The later chapters generally follow the style of "literature" gotten out by western commercial clubs. They "boost" the state's agriculture, mining, forestry, and transportation system. In these same chapters are really good sketches of the development of stock raising and irrigation, though tinged with the "booster's" spirit. The accounts of conservation and reclamation are praiseworthy.

The illustrations are numerous and excellent, and the maps are better historically than one can find in books of northwest history.

PAUL C. PHILLIPS

Kino's historical memoir of Pimeria Alta. A contemporary account of the beginnings of California, Sonora, and Arizona, by Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, S.J., pioneer missionary explorer, cartographer, and ranchman, 1683-1711. Published for the first time from the original manuscript in the archives of Mexico. In two volumes. Edited by Herbert Eugene Bolton, Ph.D., professor of American history, University of California. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark company, 1919. 379, 329 p. $12.50 net)

The present work constitutes the third and fourth volumes of *Spain in the west,* a series of documents edited, translated, and annotated by Mr. Herbert E. Bolton. In addition he furnishes an introduction that is at once scholarly and readable, a series of maps, including a large original showing Pimeria Alta in detail, and some reprints of Kino's own maps. A present day view of San Xavier del Bac, the most striking monument of Jesuit work in the region, forms an attractive frontispiece of the first volume.

Eusebio Francisco Kino was not of Spanish blood. Italian in name (he commonly spelled it as given above) he was Austrian by birth, education, and early association. Born at Trent, August 10, 1644, he entered the Jesuit order in 1665, taught mathematics, and in 1678 set out for New Spain. He reached Mexico City in 1681 and was almost immediately assigned to southern California; he did not arrive there, however, until more than two years later. He and his companions made two unsuccessful attempts to found a settlement in Lower California and in 1686 Kino was assigned to Pimeria Alta, comprising portions of Mexico, Sonora, and our own Arizona, where he labored until his death in 1711.

These simple details afford little insight into his career, nor does his own narrative, modestly called "Celestial favors," render him full justice. The mere list of his journeys recalls the labors of the Apostle Paul. As an explorer and missionary he opened up the area below the Gila and east of the Colorado, and baptized 30,000 natives. During the wanderings of a quarter century he crossed and recrossed the present international boundary, traversed southern Arizona in several directions, and followed the Gila river, and the Colorado, until finally he reached the latter's mouth. He showed the feasibility of a land route to Upper California and proved conclusively that Lower California was a peninsula. He was a shrewd observer whose impressions, carefully noted, played their part in the future development of church and nation. More interested in the prospective conversion of the natives than in their primitive life and customs, his journeys were marked by a chain of missions from which developed the native communities of the present day. His record in exploration was matched by his ability as a productive ranch-

man. He wrought with scant means and with Indian labor, but was repaid in multiplying herds and thriving crops. He was ambitious to bring success to the Jesuits and did not hesitate to point out how his plans would further national purposes. He was especially anxious to bring Sonora into touch with the Gulf of Mexico and by occupying California to assist in developing traffic between New Spain and the Philippines. He looked upon his field of labor as the most attractive portion of North America.

Yielding to the urging of his superiors, Kino, at various times during the last twelve years of his life, wrote out the story of his labors. His contemporaries incorporated portions of his narrative in their own volumes, but the *Favores celestiales* as a whole was unknown until Mr. Bolton unearthed the manuscripts in the *Archivo general* of Mexico. In the bibliography of Kino's writings, which is as complete as tireless research can make it, the editor has shown that the priest was a writer of no mean reputation, despite his manifold activities of other sorts. Some of his previous writings have been printed in *Documents para le historia de Mexico*, but the present publication more than doubles Kino's previously known writings. In his introduction and notes Mr. Bolton has drawn extensively on his previous publications and those of his associates and former pupils. Hackett, Chapman, Priestly, Mrs. Hughes, and Dunn are a few of the familiar names encountered. Much supplemental material from Mexico City and Seville has been used to clear up doubtful points in geography and chronology and the mistakes of previous writers, such as Bancroft and Richman, are corrected. Wherever possible, he wisely permits Kino to tell his own story, for there are in the narrative many passages of vivid interest. In brief, he combines original narrative and interpretative scholarship in a model manner. The volume thus is a storehouse of information for specialists, who will regret the announcement that this publication completes Mr. Bolton's projected series of narratives relating to *Spain in the west*. Possibly the sumptuous character of the work will largely account for the failure to make it profitable, but the fortunate possessors will welcome modern productive scholarship in such an attractive garb. The rest of us will hope that the editor, who really has an unlimited store of valuable manuscript material at his disposal, will find some other and cheaper means of making his collections available. The growing interest in the Hispanic field will thus find a definite area for intensive development within our own national limits.

I. J. C.

The clash. A study in nationalities. By William Henry Moore. (New York: E. P. Dutton and company, 1918. 333 p. $2.50)

Despite the many studies we have had recently of the conflicting forces of race and nationality this description of the conflict between the English and the French in Canada is timely and helpful. The best part of it is its advocacy of a scientific and liberal spirit in the treatment of French Canadians rather than the Prussian method of misrepresentation, group prejudice, and coercion. The ultimate futility and stupidity of brutality and force in adjusting the interests of different national groups is shown clearly by the experience of the French and the English in Quebec and Ontario. The author makes some attempt to analyze and compare the varying characteristics of the two groups and the differences in their impulses along commercial, economic, and religious lines. While this part of the discussion is suggestive, at times it is somewhat unconvincing and unsatisfactory. The influence of the religious factor in the situation is held to be incidental and the importance of the economic factor in the clashing of the two groups is emphasized. The bone of contention in an economic way is the region of New Ontario, a tract of 16,000,000 acres of arable land which the English Canadians apparently do not wish to colonize and which they wish to keep the French from colonizing.

The author suggests that there is a way in which these two nationalities can live under the same political allegiance, keeping the essential elements of group individuality, with a satisfying and developing life for all concerned. But that way is not along the lines of prejudice, hatred, misunderstanding, and fear which have developed up to the present time in the clash between the two groups. In these days of rampant imperialism, when the exploitation of one group by another is the usual thing, a volume like this, showing patience and industry in searching after the widest range of facts and a liberal spirit in interpreting them, is well worth while. But it does not make pleasant reading for the English Canadians.

J. G. S.

The Spanish conquerors. A chronicle of the dawn of empire overseas. By Irving Berdine Richman. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 238 p. $3.50)

This booklet, like other volumes in its series, is a beautiful example of the printer's art. It contains eight illustrations: one of these is a portrait of Columbus from the Marine museum at Madrid; another is a portrait of Hernando Cortés. Well-executed maps illustrate the voyages of Columbus, the routes of the Spanish explorers and conquerors of Mexico and Central America, and the route taken by Francisco Pizarro from Panama to Cuzco, January, 1531, to November, 1538.

The Spanish conquerors begins with a brief chapter entitled "West and east" which devotes special attention to seamen's tales concerning mythical islands in the Atlantic and to the tales of landsmen regarding the mysteries of the orient. A well-proportioned sketch of the activities of Columbus follows, in which the influence of Vignaud's critical studies is apparent. The daring achievements of Balboa, "the true precursor of Cortés," are vividly described. An account of the explorations of Córdoba and Grijalva precedes the story of the conquest of Mexico, which is accompanied by a description of Aztec culture. This is naturally followed by a tale of the Spanish conquerors in Central America. The last chapter in the book — and the longest — deals with the conquest of Peru. That chapter contains an interesting description of Inca culture, some suggestive comparisons between Aztec and Inca civilizations, and brief characterizations of the chief actors in the last scene of the Inca drama. Little or nothing is said of the conquest of northern and southern South America. Nothing is said of the transmission of culture or of colonial society.

A bibliographical note contains a short, select list of articles and books respecting the age of the *conquistadores*. Few of those titles are in Spanish. Richman has used the English material upon his theme, but evidently has not used the literature produced by Spanish-American scholars regarding pre-Columbian civilization and the Spanish conquerors. There are points in this booklet which will provoke queries in the minds of critical historical students. Still, with a distinct literary charm, it contains the best description of the Spanish conquest of Mexico and Peru in small compass.

William Spence Robertson

The Maya Indians of southern Yucatan and northern British Honduras. By Thomas W. F. Gann. [Smithsonian institution, bureau of American ethnology, bulletin 64] (Washington: Government printing office, 1918. 146 p.)

This book, as the title indicates, is an intensive study of two tribes of Maya Indians. The author makes no attempt to tell an interesting story, but one who knows something of the country and its natives will find its numerous illustrations of general interest, aside from their scientific purpose. The first portion of the book is devoted to a general description of customs and social conditions of the present day natives, and the latter portion to a description of the ancient peoples, deduced from a careful excavation of forty-one mounds, together with an accurate description of these mounds and their contents. Some attractive colored plates that show the artistic skill of the ancient Mayas complete the study.

A history of Latin America. By William Warren Sweet, professor of history, De Pauw university. (New York: Abingdon press, 1919. 283 p. $3.00 net)

The process of achievement in any pioneer work is beset with difficulty, and it often results in disappointment because others fail rightly to appreciate the effort. Hispanic-American history offers no exception to this rule. The growing group of workers in this field have long felt the need of an adequate textbook, but probably most of them have at the same time mentally sharpened their pencils in readiness for the first rash victim of their critical gauntlet. Whoever this victim may be and however prepossessing his offering, they must assume that, in default of previous guidance, his preparation for it was inadequate and his execution faulty. Nevertheless such a pioneer, while thus immolating himself on the altar of contemporary criticism, may encourage a more worthy author in his chosen field.

It is fair to ask if the present work answers reasonably well the purpose of this sacrifice. The publishers claim that the book is "especially valuable and illuminating — broad in scope, pleasing and picturesque in style — thoroughly logical in treatment [and] equally useful and popular as a text for college classes and for general reading." Such commendation might well smooth the pioneer's pathway, but a careful examination of the book fails to substantiate the claims of the publishers and Mr. Sweet runs the double risk of overpraise and hypercriticism.

If the present reviewer were to content himself with a charge involving the latter fault, he might dismiss the book in a few words. But, so far, all the reviews he has seen have been perfunctory in character or have displayed an enthusiasm born of ignorance, with one notable exception — and that review was so brief as to be enigmatical to all but the initiated. The need of a suitable text in Hispanic-American history is so great that much damage may be done, as the reviewer has had occasion to note, by permitting the defects of the present volume to pass unchallenged.

The author was in military service while his book was going through the press — a fact which doubtless accounts for many of the errors that mar nearly every page. Some may gain the impression, however, that they are not wholly due to faulty proof reading; therefore it is only just to make the statement here.

The volume is intended for those who do not read Spanish and the author obviously places himself in their company. It may seem meticulous, therefore, to note the lack of accents or of words in italics. But if "Casa de Contratación" (p. 97) and "Asunción" (p. 80) are deemed worthy of the accent (but not of a change of type) why should the ac-

cent be lacking in "Aymará" (p. 29), "Velásquez" and "Narváez" (p. 49), "Zúñiga" (p. 126 — also lacking the tilda), and in scores of other instances? We are developing in our schools a host of readers who have at least a smattering of Spanish, and authors should do their part to train these readers in correct writing and pronunciation of the language.

If we pardon the omission of diacritical marks, except in a few favored instances, what shall be said of such grammatical blunders as "las Navos de Tolosa" (p. 16), "tierra calientes" (p. 26), "Bull of Cruzado" (p. 115), and "Argentinas" (pp. 144, 156, 157, 159)? The iteration of the last named suggests a woeful uncertainty in regard to sex distinctions in Spanish America — an unfortunate predicament, as more than one hapless traveler has found to his cost.

The proof reading, as intimated above, was largely perfunctory, if we may judge from "Boetica" and "Terraconensis" (p. 9), "Recared" (p. 10), "Galacians" (p. 8), "Ximines" (p. 17), "Parades" (p. 204), and "Saville" (p. 38, in two consecutive lines). "Asturia" (p. 14) lacks the final "s" as do "Chagre" (p. 109) and "Terraza" (p. 245), but "Chapetone" (p. 123) has an unnecessary final "e." "Hereda" (p. 77), "Franca" (p. 183), "Arca" (p. 185), "New Granadans" (p. 151), lack an essential "i," which appears unnecessarily in "Cartagenia" (pp. 146, 151). "Tajada" (p. 208) should appear as "Lerdo de Tejada," or simply "Lerdo," while the author of *La Auracania* (p. 126) is more familiar as "Ercilla," or "Ercilla y Zúñiga." "Ulua" (p. 130) is not the acceptable spelling, as the author himself shows (p. 56), and "quinua" (p. 242) is equally bad. "Dom" (p. 79) is not the Spanish title nor "Ayres" (p. 83), the preferable spelling for Argentina's capital. The English "Saint Mark" (p. 126) is allowable but "San Domingo" (p. 148) is not good Spanish, nor is "San Salvador" (p. 225) the name of the Central American republic. There is little excuse for printing "Morales" for Morelos (p. 170) three times on the same page.

This list gives merely typical specimens of errors in proof reading and is by no means complete. As a college text, therefore, the book obviously bears a severe typographical handicap; and one is led to examine its reliability on other points. The reviewer notes a number of more or less slight mistakes in dates (pp. 83, 130, 143, 150, 208, 210, 262). Miranda was not in the United States "at the opening of the Revolutionary struggle" (p. 142) nor did he return to his native land "at the close" (p. 148) of the conflict. A study of Robertson's monograph would have set the author right upon these points. He should also have made it clear that the projected uprising in Mexico

(p. 130) was associated with the son of the conqueror, not the great Cortés himself. The Mexican constitution of 1917, if we may trust current protests, does not follow the "broad lines of the constitution of 1857" (p. 216) as closely as some interests wish. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty did not definitely provide for the "joint control of the canal by the United States and Great Britain," nor did the ambition of William Walker contemplate "the conquest of all Spanish America" (p. 212). Scroggs' recent monograph should have been consulted on this point, but it is not mentioned in the bibliography on the opposite page. Yucatan is not "a low sandy plain" (p. 25) nor is it accurate to say that the temperature of Mexico's *tierra fria* (p. 26) corresponds to that of the United States. Tacna and Arica were taken by Chile from Peru not Bolivia (p. 187). Guadalupe Victoria is the official name of the first president of Mexico, not Guerrero (p. 203). Texas was not a separate state in the Mexican republic (*ibid.*) but part of Coahuila. The Spanish authorities made the grant of 1820 to Moses Austin, not to his son Stephen (*ibid.*). "Fannin" (*ibid.*) is the name of the commander of the Texas troops, not of the place where he was defeated. "Indian House" is not an acceptable English rendering of *Casa de Contratación.* "Peons, Indians and half-breeds" (p. 227) is not a scientifically correct expression for Mexico's population. Henequén should be included among the important products of Mexico (p. 243). The proportion of Indians in Brazil's population (p. 221) seems too low.

The above list, incomplete as it is, shows a tendency to inaccuracy in the book as unfortunate as the faulty proof reading. This is all the more regrettable because the author writes well and in a manner to please the average reader. He contributes a number of sketch maps of Spain and of the American continents that would prove more useful if we could know certainly upon what they were based. The same thing is true of the statistics that are scattered through his later chapters. They represent, however, a worthy attempt to link his narrative with commercial activities. Each chapter ends with a brief bibliography, giving the most obvious books available in English. The student who knows Spanish is told that he may profitably read the *Recopilación de leyes de los reinos de las Indias,* although he could do so with greater profit after perusing the brief discussion of this source in Harig's *Trade and navigation between Spain and the Indies.* But one wonders how much "valuable information" any reader will get from Mrs. Tweedie's *Life of Porfirio Diaz* (p. 213).

As casually indicated in the foregoing paragraphs, the author is evidently unfamiliar with the monographic material bearing upon certain phases of his work. In the West Indies, Harig, Westergaard, Mims,

Wright, and Pittman have produced important studies that shed new light upon colonial conditions in that area. Bolton, Chapman, Priestley, Dunn, Hughes, Hackett, and Marshall — not to mention others — have cleared up many obscure spots in the history of Mexico and of our own southwest. Sir Clements Markham for an earlier day, and Miss Williams and Mr. Scroggs for a later period, have written entertainingly and informingly upon Central America, Colombia, and Peru. Surely a writer of the present day, even if he merely aims to produce a popular compendium, must make some use of these works. If Irving and Prescott are one's chief guides the reader may expect to encounter the Roderick myth (p. 12), but no adequate account of colonial administrative machinery (p. 38) or explanation of unfamiliar offices (e. g. *corregidor*, pp. 95, 121). The author seems to favor such a source as Fiske rather than Helps; and occasionally his narrative is too nearly like another's for conscientious comfort (cf. p. 122 and Bourne, *Spain in America*, p. 265).

In treating the tangled maze of Hispanic history it is extremely difficult to keep the time and place factors clearly in view. For this reason the reader might merely question the method of treating the Spanish colonies (chapters IX-XI inclusive) without adverse comment, but he would certainly expect to find these areas more closely connected with the corresponding modern republics than they are in this book, and the interrelation between these nationalities more thoroughly shown. The reader might also ask for a more conclusive explanation of the causes of our own revolution (p. 112), or of the Mexican war (pp. 204, 205), or of recent happenings in Mexico (pp. 256, 257), or of our much maligned Monroe doctrine (p. 263). With regard to the early phases of Pan-Americanism, the author should certainly give some attention to the claims of our own Jefferson as its originator, or even James Wilkinson, as well as to the claims of Henry Clay and Bolívar (p. 267).

To sum up the matter: Mr. Sweet undertook a worthy task without adequately preparing himself for it; because of war-time duties he lacked opportunity to bestow upon each step the painstaking care that scholarship demands. Thus his faults and misfortunes have largely neutralized his commendable purpose. I. J. C.

South and Central American trade conditions of today. New and revised edition with complete information to 1919. By A. Hyatt Verrill. (New York: Dodd, Mead and company, 1919. 212 p. $1.50)

Understanding South America. By Clayton Sedgwick Cooper. (New York: George H. Doran company, [1918]. 426 p. $2.00 net)

Neither of these volumes is historical in character, but both will be found useful for a course in Hispanic-American history. Mr. Cooper

gives wider scope to his work than Mr. Verrill. He devotes his chapters chiefly to the separate countries of South America, but precedes this major portion of the volume with some general observations and ends it with some consideration of present social and economic conditions. He writes sympathetically and from actual experience; but he does not hesitate to point out some just criticisms of his whilom hosts, usually uttered by themselves. He seems to generalize too readily and not all his characterizations can be accepted without being carefully checked with authoritative sources. Yet his volume will be useful for a general study of South America, possibly supplementing the better-known books of Bryce and Ross.

Mr. Verrill, in this revised edition of his earlier book, is wholly commercial, and his book thus has its field clearly defined. Yet it will have some use for the historical student. The latter will find the "Facts and figures" of part 3 convenient for reference, in lieu of better authorities. He would have more confidence in them had the author indicated the sources of his information.

Both volumes touch upon the effects of the war. Mr. Cooper devotes a chapter to exposing the workings of German intrigue in Latin America, and often mentions prospective conditions following the world conflict. Mr. Verrill shows the changes in exports and imports during the war itself, but gives little encouragement for a continuance of our commercial advantage, now that war-time restrictions are removed. From his pages one gathers the impression that our merchants are not yet using in any great measure such improved methods as we have been led to expect.

Mexico. From Cortes to Carranza. By Louise S. Hasbrouck. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1918. 330 p. $1.50 net)

Mexico under Carranza. A lawyer's indictment of the crowning infamy of four hundred years of misrule. By Thomas Edward Gibbon. (New York: Doubleday, Page and company, 1919. 270 p. $1.50)

Mexico today and tomorrow. By E. D. Trowbridge. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 282 p. $2.00)

These three volumes, figuring among the recent popular books on Mexico, are of varying merit. Miss Hasbrouck starts out with the worthy purpose of making the history of Mexico attractive for children. She succeeds fairly well albeit with some regrettable perversion of historical facts and some typographical errors and misspellings. About half of her volume, as might be anticipated, is concerned with the Aztecs and the career of Cortes. There is a chapter devoted to the life of Aztec children and another in which a child is supposed to tell the story of Mexico's struggle for independence from the Spanish rule.

Modern events are not neglected. The chapter on "Diaz the despot" is more sympathetic than its title implies. The author is inclined to regard the professions of the recent revolutionists as *faits accomplis*, especially in Yucatan, but this may represent a sympathetic attempt to develop the personalities of recent leaders.

Mr. Trowbridge has given us a wonderful book of unusual interest. About a third of the volume treats of events and conditions preceding Diaz. This permits a comparatively full treatment of the situation since 1910. The author writes from a full personal knowledge of the country and with evident sympathy for recent changes, but he describes them without undue partiality. It is refreshing to note that his business experience does not lead him to favor military intervention by the United States and that he can discuss the financial expedients of Carranza without displaying undue warmth. His description of social and economic conditions is especially good. One who gives the volume careful perusal cannot fail to gain a clearer idea of existing Mexican problems.

In Mr. Gibbon's volume we encounter the familiar indictment of the enraged capitalist. The author does not attempt to be fair; he charges against Carranza all the evils that now afflict Mexico, because under a semi-industrial régime, such as Mexico has entered during the last generation, revolutionary outbreaks have become so much more disastrous than formerly. He rightly suggests that racial conditions account for much of Mexico's woe, but his statement of the relative proportions of the constituent elements is misleading, as is also his indiscriminate condemnation of the "Latinized" element. Naturally he finds nothing commendable either in the sentiments or policy of our own administration and looks for salvation, avowedly for the *peons*, only through intervention, such as England has made in Egypt. If one adds that the author is an attorney from Los Angeles, he has sufficiently indicated the *odor* that accompanies the book.

A short history of Japan. By Ernest Wilson Clement. (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1916. 190 p. $1.00)

Modern Japan. Social, industrial, political. By Amos S. Hershey and Susanne W. Hershey. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill company, 1919. 382 p. $1.50)

Japan and world peace. By K. K. Kawakami. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 196 p. $1.50)

The mastery of the far east. The story of Korea's transformation and Japan's rise to supremacy in the orient. By Arthur Judson Brown. (New York: Scribner's, 1919. 671 p. $6.00)

The title of Mr. Clement's *Short history of Japan* is accurately chosen. It would be difficult to write a more compact summary. Fifteen hun-

dred years of recorded history are condensed into one-tenth as many pages. Of these ninety-seven deal with the period before 1853 and fifty-five with the later years. In addition there is an appendix describing the physiography of the empire, and useful lists are given of emperors and shoguns, and the name period used in Japanese chronology. If one can only give a few hours to mastering the outlines of Japanese history then the present work will well repay perusal. But the time has come when Japan merits more consideration and it is to be hoped that Mr. Clement will develop this outline into a more comprehensive study.

Modern Japan, by Mr. Amos S. Hershey and Susanne W. Hershey, is a very helpful summary of the social, industrial, and political conditions in the empire to the most recent times. A considerable portion of the volume deals with political affairs, including a study of the government and constitution, political parties, the expansion of Japan, and her relations with China and the United States. These chapters contain much more that is of deep interest at the present moment. The chapters on social conditions include a discussion of the family in Japan, the position of women, the educational system, and the native and foreign religions. Especially valuable are the studies of the industrial order and the social and economic conditions arising from it. This is the best recent study of industrial Japan which is easily accessible. The volume is one which should be widely read in this country. And the authors have tried so faithfully to learn the facts and to present them in a fair manner that every thoughtful Japanese should welcome the criticisms which are frequently offered.

The latest contribution of the Japanese journalist, K. K. Kawakami, is entitled *Japan and world peace.* Its purpose is "to describe Japan's place in the League of Nations," and "to explain the aspirations and hopes, fears and misgivings, which Japan will entertain under the new world regime, as under the old." In the preface the author points out that the foremost problem of Japan today is the population problem, and with this is entwined the question of Japan's iron and coal supply. If Japan must keep her expanding population at home she must develop as an industrial and trading nation. To do this requires coal and iron, of which she possesses little. "Here, in a nutshell, is the condition which furnishes the underlying motives as well as the impelling power to Japan's policies, internal and foreign." The eleven chapters deal principally with Japan's part in the war and with Chinese-Japanese relations. They make interesting reading, for Mr. Kawakami is a well-informed publicist and wields a facile pen. In statements of fact his work compares very favorably with western writers on far eastern affairs,

but in matters of opinion and interpretation he naturally presents the point of view of Japan, which makes his articles of value to anyone who would understand what has happened in the far east in the past decade.

One of the worth-while books on Japan is *The mastery of the far east* by Arthur Judson Brown. It appeared with remarkable timeliness just as the news of the Korean disturbances reached this country. Mr. Brown considers the Korean peninsula "the strategic point in the mastery of the Far East," and about two-thirds of the volume deals with that country. First comes an account of old Korea and the struggle between China, Japan, and Russia for possession; other chapters deal with Japanese rule in Korea and the missionary problem there. The rest of the book deals with present conditions in Japan. The volume stands out as one of the most open-minded discussions of far eastern politics which has been offered the American reader. Mr. Brown, who has been for years the secretary of the Presbyterian board of foreign missions, has tried to get the facts and to do justice to Japan, Korea, and China in considering the many controversial questions which have arisen. And even in dealing with the missionary problems in Korea he has not allowed his calling to interfere with his sense of justice. The reviewer knows of no more accurate or saner account of conditions in Korea on the eve of the independence movement, and a perusal of Mr. Brown's chapters will enable one to understand many of the news items which have come from Korea since March.

PAYSON J. TREAT

NEWS AND COMMENTS

The following committees have been appointed to serve during the current year for the Mississippi valley historical association: program, John W. Oliver, Indianapolis, chairman, Theodore C. Blegen, Wayland J. Chase, Oliver M. Dickerson, Walter L. Fleming, Paul Leland Haworth; nominating, Albert H. Sanford, La Crosse, Wisconsin, chairman, Otto L. Schmidt, Orin G. Libby; local arrangements, W. W. Sweet, Greencastle, Indiana, chairman.

British-American discords and concords is the title of a little volume published by G. P. Putnam's Sons (New York, 1918. 85 p. $.75) It is compiled by the History circle of New York, an organization composed of historians of authority, business men, editors, writers, and others. This monograph is the result of a year's labor of a committee of these members. It is a concise, authoritative survey of three epochs in American history: 1607-1763, 1763-1815, and 1815-1898; it shows in a truly historical manner the relations existing between England and America which tended toward a feeling of discord, and how through a present-day study of those same conditions a feeling of harmony has arisen. An excellent bibliography accompanies the text. The maiden effort of the History circle should receive commendation and it is to be hoped that more monographs will be given to the public from the same source.

"Important as the formal work of the Peace Congress may be there is a more fundamental and permanent work of reconstruction that must fall on each nation — a reconstruction built on the hopes, the convictions, the struggles, the dreams of the peoples." This is the view taken by Mr. Cecil Fairfield Lavell in his book, *Reconstruction and national life* (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 193 p. $1.60). The author does not claim to give more than an introductory survey of Europe's problems of reconstruction, limiting his study to four peoples, the French, German, Russian, and British. His style is clear and interesting and the book should be an incentive to further study of this important problem. A brief index is provided but no bibliography.

In contrast with the above mentioned book is one on the same subject of reconstruction by Herbert Quick, entitled *From war to peace* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill company, 1919. 278 p. $1.50). A practical treatment of the problem is here offered rather than an historical ap-

proach to the subject. The author makes a plea for education, regarding that as a panacea for the prevailing ills following as aftermath of the great war. The problem of unemployment he thinks should not come up, since there is plenty of necessary work "that aches to be done."

A little book entitled *The great issue*, "disclosed by the leaders and the plain people in Europe and America" (Boston: Marshall Jones company, 1919. 46 p. $1.00 net) is chiefly a compilation of extracts from the speeches of President Wilson and other public men. Although few comments are supplied by the author, John Farwell Moss, his object is to show President Wilson's purpose "a scheme of world salvation." Extracts of speeches are often misleading when taken out of their setting, and one can not help feeling that the subject has been treated too briefly. In order to make his point emphatic the editor should give longer quotations and fuller explanations.

Two suggestive pamphlets were issued recently by the American association for international conciliation, one regarding the league of nations, and the other on the peace conference.

Volume IV of the *Journal of the National institute of social sciences* is devoted to a discussion of reconstruction after the war. Reports on various phases of the subject are given by Thorstein Veblen, George E. Roberts, Grosvenor Atterbury, and others.

A convenient little volume of obvious usefulness is the bibliography of the Monroe doctrine recently issued by the Library of Congress. It was compiled under the direction of Mr. Herman H. B. Meyer, chief bibliographer, and contains a wide range of references.

Anyone owning contemporary letters, documents, or other historical materials pertaining to George Washington's southern tour in 1791 is respectfully requested to communicate with Archibald Henderson, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, who is preparing a book on the subject.

On Tuesday, April 22, 1919, Pittsburgh celebrated the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of its incorporation as a borough. As this was also the centennial year of the incorporation of the Western university of Pennsylvania, now the University of Pittsburgh, the Historical society of Western Pennsylvania, which had charge of the celebration undertook to combine the observance of these two events. An account of the ceremony is described in the July number of the *Western historical magazine.*

An interesting and well-written account entitled "A tour in 1807 down the Cumberland, Ohio, and Mississippi rivers from Nashville to New

Orleans,'' is found in the April, 1919, number of the *Tennessee historical magazine.* This is supplemented by carefully edited footnotes which add greatly to the value of the narrative.

Mr. Van Lieu Minor, former head of the department of history and economics in the Middle Tennessee normal at Murfreesboro, Tennessee, is engaged in graduate work at the University of Michigan, being on leave of absence.

An extremely interesting meeting of the Ohio valley historical association was held at Berea college, Berea, Kentucky, October 16-18, 1919. The custom of emphasising the history of the locality where the meeting is held was followed in the formal program on this occasion; the social events included receptions at ''Boone's Tavern'' and at the ''Log Cabin,'' the home of the ''Fireside industries,'' as well as an excursion to the ''Indian fort,'' a relic of prehistoric times commanding the finest mountain view in the region, and portions of the old ''Wilderness Road.'' At the business meeting Mr. W. H. Siebert of Ohio state university was elected president; and Miss Elizabeth Crowther of Western college for women, Oxford, Ohio, was chosen secretary-treasurer.

A clever address delivered by Mr. Emilius O. Randall before the Ohio society of New York on November 12, 1917, entitled ''High lights in Ohio literature,'' is published in the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* for July, 1919; it gives many interesting historical facts relative to the settlement and development of the state as well as an excellent summary of Ohio literary achievements. In the same issue will be found an account of Ohio in the war of 1812, based chiefly on excerpts from the first newspaper published in the Western Reserve, the *Trump of fame.* This organ was edited by Thomas D. Webb, and its first publication was on June 16, 1812.

Mr. Chauncey S. Boucher, formerly at Washington university, St. Louis, is now in the department of American history at Ohio state university, Columbus.

The department of Indiana history and archives of the Indiana state library contemplates the publication in the near future of a calendar of the papers of John Tipton. These valuable manuscripts were secured by the department a few years ago and during the past year have been carefully classified and calendared. The immediate work has been accomplished by Miss Margaret Norton, under the direction of Mr. Harlow Lindley, director of the department.

Mr. William Sweet, professor of history at DePauw university, will give a series of lectures at Drew theological seminary, Madison, New Jersey, during the week of December 7-12, 1919. The general subject

of the lectures will be "The introduction of Methodism into the Mississippi valley."

Mr. Henry Noble Sherwood, professor of European history at Franklin college, Franklin, Indiana, has been made dean of that college.

Mr. George B. Manhart has been appointed instructor in history at Depauw university. Mr. Manhart was for two years in war library service, and previous to that was instructor in history at Baker university.

The first number of volume two of the *Illinois Catholic historical review* gives good indication that the standard set by volume one is to be maintained. Topics of interest are: "A bit of history of the Franciscans in Illinois," "Old Kaskaskia days and ways," and "A chapter in Illinois finances." In addition an illuminating account of the French in Illinois is given by Joseph J. Thompson; his discussion, however, is open to the criticism that too much emphasis is placed on the element singled out, for the French are given credit for the entire work of exploration and settlement, for the whole work of planting Christianity in the state, and for being the deciding factor in bringing success to the Virginia conquest and giving to the United States a vast empire. Important as was the influence of the French, they can scarcely be given undivided honors.

According to the September issue of the *Wisconsin magazine of history*, the war history committee of that state appointed by the state council of defense in 1918 has made a notable historical drive to insure the current records of Wisconsin's part in the great war. The work is being carried on under the immediate direction of the state historical society. The "war mothers" of the state have been giving very active assistance in organizing the work in the various counties, and in collecting the military letters and pictures desired to make the work more complete.

From a bundle of old newspapers found in the garret of an old farmhouse in Stratham, New Hampshire, Herbert C. Varney secured the material for a very interesting paper entitled "Birth notices of a state." This is to be found in the *Minnesota history bulletin* for May, 1919.

A very systematic and complete study of the militia in Iowa has been made by Cyril P. Upham in the July number of the *Iowa journal of history and politics*. This is primarily an historical survey although it contains a plea for the organization of well-organized and drilled militia companies at the present day. Those interested in the settlement of Wisconsin and Minnesota will find an excellent article in the same magazine by Cardinal Goodwin.

The legislature of Iowa at the last session provided that in all three-year high schools the subjects of American history and civics of the state and nation be given for at least two semesters. In all four-year high schools the additional requirement is made of social problems and economics for one semester.

Mr. Louis Pelzer of the University of Iowa is at present working on a textbook on contemporary American history to cover the period after 1877.

Mr. Arthur Henry Hirsch, who has been at the head of the history work at Morningside College at Sioux City, Iowa, has been chosen to fill a similar position at Ohio Wesleyan university at Delaware.

Missouri has already begun to publish her war records in a series of articles appearing in the *Missouri historical review*. The sixth in the series, in the July, 1919, issue, treats of the work of the war governor of the state, Frederick D. Gardner, and of his activities during the war. Missouri, it may be mentioned, has shown its appreciation of its soldier sons in a very practical way by making every effort to help returned soldiers find jobs.

Charles M. Correll, formerly of the State normal school, Mayville, North Dakota, has accepted the chair of history of Fargo college.

Mr. Harrison A. Trexler, formerly of the department of economics in the University of Montana, has transferred to Whitman college, Walla Walla, Washington.

A study of the newspapers of Mississippi between the years 1835 and 1844 has been made by James E. Winston in the *Southwestern historical quarterly* for July, 1919. He has studied especially the question of the Texas annexation sentiment in Mississippi, and the result of his investigation is an informing piece of historical work.

Mr. Percy S. Flippin is now serving as professor of history at Mercer university.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. VI, NO. 4 MARCH, 1920

ISAAC SHELBY AND THE GENET MISSION

The famous episode in which Edmund Charles Genet, the representative of the new French republic, played the highly dramatic leading rôle is certainly one of the most extraordinary in our national annals. In order to understand the significance of the episode and its relation to Isaac Shelby, it is imperatively necessary to understand the popular temper in the country at the time it occurred, and in particular the temper of Kentucky.

In Kentucky, one of the leading features of dissatisfaction with the federal government was the popular conviction that the leading federalist statesmen of the country were lukewarm in advocacy of the demand for the opening of the Mississippi to western commerce. Ever since the excitement aroused by Jay's reputed proposal to cede to Spain for twenty-five years the navigation of the Mississippi river in return for commercial advantages to be enjoyed by the eastern states alone, the temper of the Kentucky people had tended steadily toward opposition to the Spaniards who held Louisiana and resolutely denied to the United States the free navigation of the Mississippi. The hostility towards the Spaniards was aggravated by the fact that they were allied in the war against France with Great Britain, which still retained the northwest posts in defiance of its treaty obligations. The inevitable result was to arouse the sentiment of the people of Kentucky in behalf of France against the alliance of England and Spain which, in fact, effectively closed the Mississippi to the commerce of the west. Moreover, many Americans throughout the country — for the sentiment was by no means confined to Kentucky alone — felt most warmly towards France, the ally of America in the revolution. In con-

nection with the position and attitude of Isaac Shelby during the crisis which arose, it must be borne in mind that he had been an ardent fighter for independence during the revolution and looked upon Frenchmen as friends and brothers.[1]

The sentiment of vehement friendship for France found vent in the United States through the instrumentality of the "Democratic clubs," emanating in especial from a central source in the Democratic society of Philadelphia established early in 1793. As early as August of the same year, one of these clubs was organized in Lexington, Kentucky; soon similar organizations sprang up in Georgetown, Paris, and other Kentucky towns.[2] Through the instrumentality of these societies, sentiment was rapidly developed and organized. When Genet landed at Charleston on April 8, 1793, he inaugurated a most vigorous and sensational campaign of propaganda on behalf of the new French republic. "His system," said General John Steele to Alexander Hamilton (Salisbury, North Carolina, April 30, 1793), "is to laugh us into the war, if he can." Genet's meddlesome activities in the way of actually fitting out ships for the service of France against England, however, were effectually stopped by Washington's proclamation of neutrality, April 22, 1793. Blocked in this direction, Genet now turned his attention to the task of enlisting the sentiment of the entire country on the side of France. Receiving what he chose to regard as tacit encouragement from Jefferson, an ardent democrat and lover of France, Genet deliberately proceeded, by appealing directly to the people of the United States, to invoke the armed assistance of American citizens against the Spanish possessions in the southwest. By recruiting an army against the Spaniards at New Orleans, Genet hoped to embroil the United States in a war with Spain and eventually with Spain's ally, Great Britain.

The effect of Genet's machinations, carried on at first through his agent, Michaux, soon exhibited itself in Kentucky. Many prominent citizens, feeling embittered against Spain for the

[1] For Shelby's career as a soldier, consult Archibald Henderson, "Isaac Shelby," in two parts, in *North Carolina booklet*, 16: 109 ff.; 18: 3 ff.

[2] Mann Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky, from its exploration and settlement . . . to the close of the northwestern campaign, in 1813; with an introduction exhibiting the settlement of western Virginia . . . in 1736, to the treaty of Camp Charlotte . . . in 1774* (second edition — Cincinnati, 1836), 223.

closure of the Mississippi, welcomed the opportunity to express themselves in no uncertain terms; and in October, 1793, the Democratic society of Lexington went on record in a violent resolution: "That the right of the people on the waters of the Mississippi, to the navigation, was *undoubted*; and . . . ought to be *peremptorily* demanded of Spain, by the government of the United States."[3] A printed address, giving evidence of a plot being hatched in Philadelphia to enlist a force in Kentucky against the Spanish dominions on the Mississippi, had come into the possession of the commissioners of Spain as early as the summer of 1793; and following their complaint to President Washington, the secretary of state, Thomas Jefferson, transmitted the address to Governor Shelby of Kentucky in a letter (August 29, 1793), in which he said: "I have it therefore in charge from the President to desire you to be particularly attentive to any attempts of this kind among the citizens of Kentucky, and if you shall have reason to believe any such enterprize meditated, that you put them on their guard against the consequence, as all acts of hostility committed by them on nations at peace with the United States are forbidden by the laws and will expose them to punishment; And that in every event, you take those legal measures which shall be necessary to prevent any such enterprize. In addition to considerations respecting the peace of the general union, the special interests of the state of Kentucky would be particularly committed, as nothing could be more inauspicious to them than such a movement, at the very moment when those interests are under negociation between Spain and the United States."[4]

Little more than a month later, Shelby replied to this letter of the secretary of state. In his letter (October 5, 1793) Shelby was direct and explicit, speaking in no uncertain terms regarding his attitude in the matter: "I think it my duty to take this early opportunity to assure you that I shall be particularly attentive to prevent any attempts of that nature from this country. I am well persuaded, at present, none such is in contem-

[3] Humphrey Marshall, *History of Kentucky. Exhibiting an account of the modern discovery; settlement; progressive improvement; civil and military transactions; and the present state of the country* . . . (second edition — Frankfort, 1824), 2: 92.

[4] *Kentucky Gazette*, July 19, 1794.

plation in this place. The citizens of Kentucky possess too just a sense of the obligations they owe the general government, to embark in any enterprise that would be so injurious to the United States."[5]

At the time of writing this letter, it is clear that Governor Shelby was confident that no such enterprise was under way in Kentucky. But he was soon to be undeceived. On November 9, Jefferson again writes to Shelby, naming the four agents of France, Lachaise, Depeau, Mathurin, and Gignoux; and urging him to restrain the conspirators by law, if possible, but in case legal statutes should prove inadequate to meet the situation, to suppress the expedition by the militia of the state, as had been ordered and practiced in the other states. "I hope," he added, "that the citizens of Kentucky will not be decoyed into any participation in these illegal enterprises against the peace of their country, by any effect from them on the navigation of the Mississippi. Their good sense will tell them, that it is not to be effected by half measures of this kind, and that their surest dependence is on those regular measures which are pursuing and will be pursued by the general Government, and which flow from the united authority of all the States."[6] In the same enclosure (November 9, 1793), the secretary of war addressed a letter to Shelby pointing out that the expedition in contemplation, if permitted to proceed, would constitute a breach of neutrality, and consequently involve the United States in a war with Spain; and stating explicitly: "The secretary of state has suggested how this design may be prevented by the usual course of the laws — but if this mode should be ineffectual, I am authorized by the president of the United States, to request that your excellency will use effectual military force to prevent the execution of the plan of the said Frenchmen, or any other persons who may support, or abet their design. For the lawful expenses of which the United States will be held responsible."[7]

At this same time (November 7, 1793) Arthur St. Clair, governor of the Northwest territory, addressed a letter to Governor Shelby, in which he said: "I have received pretty direct

[5] *Kentucky Gazette*, July 19, 1794.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 97.

information which I think necessary to communicate to you—that General Clark has received a commission from the government of France, and is about to raise a body of men in Kentucky to attack the Spanish settlements upon the Mississippi. Should a business of this kind be prosecuted, the nation, Sir, would probably be involved in very serious difficulties, as well as the country over which you preside. It would appear that some measures to counteract it, should be taken immediately; more especially, if it be true, what report says, that a large sum of money, a paymaster, and a number of French officers, are arrived at the Falls of Ohio; and a number of boats for the expedition laid down. There can be no doubt, a matter of this kind, would not escape your vigilance. But as I got the account of it in a manner that would not probably reach you, I thought it my duty to give you, it over, which must be my excuse for troubling you at this time."[8]

Once assured his information was entirely authentic, St. Clair with commendable promptness issued a vigorous proclamation at Marietta, on December 7, 1793. The vital feature of it was as follows: "And it having been communicated to me through the Secretary of War, that the representatives of Spain have made representations to him, of the designs of certain Frenchmen by the names of La Chaise, Charles Delpeau, Mathurin and Signeux to excite and engage as many as they could, whether of our citizens or others, to undertake an expedition against the Spanish settlements within our neighborhood, I have thought it fit to issue this Proclamation requiring all the inhabitants of the territory of the United States North West of the Ohio, and they are hereby required, and commanded to observe a strict neutrality towards Spain, to abstain from every hostility against the subjects or settlements of that Crown, and forbidding all and every of the said inhabitants to join themselves to the said La Chaise, Charles Delpeau, Mathurin and Signeux, or either of them, in any attempt they may meditate against the Spanish settlements on the Mississippi, or to aid or abbett them in the

[8] Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 98; Lewis Collins, *Historical sketches of Kentucky: embracing its history, antiquities and natural curiosities, geographical, statistical, and geological descriptions; with anecdotes of pioneer life and . . . biographical sketches of distinguished pioneers, soldiers, statesmen, jurists, lawyers, divines, etc.* (Maysville, Kentucky, and Cincinnati, 1850), 278.

same in any manner whatsoever; and all persons who may offend, may depend upon being prosecuted and punished with the utmost rigor of the law. And I do hereby require and command all officers Civil and Military to use their utmost endeavours to prevent the said La Chaise, Delpeau, Mathurin and Signeux, or either of them, from making any Levies of men, or other preparations within the Territory, and to imprison them should they have the audacity to attempt it, and to restrain all and every one of the inhabitants from joining themselves to them, or either of them."[9] It should be pointed out that this proclamation fully conformed with the policy of the general government, as expounded in detail to Shelby by the secretary of war.

At the time of convening the legislature of Kentucky on November 6, Governor Shelby had not received the three letters above mentioned. As he himself expressly states, he did not receive the letters from the secretary of state and the secretary of war until late in December. Nor had he then any important or tangible evidence that there was a serious movement on foot in Kentucky of the kind described. Moreover, he had no information of any detailed sort as to any efforts being made by the general government in behalf of Kentucky in its desire for the free navigation of the Mississippi, beyond the vague and indefinite statement of Jefferson in his letter of August 29, 1793: "In addition to considerations respecting the peace of the general union, the special interests of the State of Kentucky would be particularly committed, as nothing could be more inauspicious to them than such a movement, at the very moment when those interests are under negociation between Spain and the United States."[10] That Governor Shelby did not, later in the session, make a special address to the legislature on this subject of burning popular interest and concern is a question which has been the subject of considerable controversy. In view of the fact that he lacked precise and complete information regarding the true designs of the French agents of Genet in Kentucky, such an address might well have been ill-advised in time and unduly alarming in effect. While appealing to the passions of the people by giving credence to the sensational stories which at this time lacked proper authentication, such an address or proc-

[9] *Kentucky Gazette*, February 8, 1794.
[10] *Ibid.*, July 19, 1794.

lamation would probably have been powerless to allay the popular hostility to Spain and disaffection to the general government by the vague and cryptic allusion of Jefferson to a "negociation" then in progress between the United States and Spain.

Meantime, the agents of Genet had reached Kentucky, and immediately proceeded to sound Governor Shelby in regard to their extraordinary and unneutral project. Writing from Knob Lick, November 25, 1793, and addressing Shelby as "Citizen Governor," Lachaise expressed his regret at being unable to deliver to the governor in person "letters which I was intrusted with by the minister," and ventured the hope that he might see him at his (Shelby's) home, should he pay a visit there in the near future. Writing from the same place on the same date, Charles Depeau informed the "Citizen Governor" that he had been dispatched in company with other Frenchmen to join the expedition of the Mississippi, continuing as follows: "As I am to procure the provisions, I am happy to communicate to you, whatever you shall think worthy of my motive, or in which your advice may be of use to me, as I hope I have in no way disobliged you; if I have, I will most willingly ask your pardon. For nobody can be more than I am willing for your prosperity and happiness. As some strange reports has reached my ears that your excellence has positive orders to arrest all citizens inclining to our assistance, and as my remembrance know by your conduct, in justice you will satisfy me in this uncommon request."[11] From these two letters it seems clear that these Frenchmen had been led to believe, perhaps by Senator Brown, at Philadelphia, that Governor Shelby, as an individual at least, was hostile to the Spaniards and favorable to the French. In a postscript, Depeau went so far as to make the following request: "Please to participate [distribute?] some of these handbills, to that noble society of democrats; I also enclose a paper from Pittsburgh." The purpose of these presumptuous letters is obviously to take the measure of the governor and learn from him the exact nature of his official disposition towards the proposed undertaking. In reply to this second letter, Shelby wrote to Depeau from Frankfort on November 28, stating the substance of the instructions he had received from the secretary of state,

[11] For these two letters and Shelby's reply see Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 99 ff.

and adding only these words: "To which charge I must pay that attention which my present situation obliges me." The phrase, "my present situation," gives a somewhat dubious and equivocal meaning to the governor's statement; but anyone familiar with his way of expressing himself and with the formal phraseology of the day would probably conclude that the statement was intended merely to mean that whatever his personal feelings towards France as a nation might be, he would in his official capacity as governor of Kentucky see that the laws of the country were enforced. It is highly probable that at the time of writing this letter Shelby had not informed himself as to whether there were laws then on the statute books in Kentucky covering the case in question. Nor does it appear that he had resolved to invoke the military power of the state should no legal remedy be available.

On December 2, Governor St. Clair received a letter from the secretary of war, "announcing the design of certain Frenchmen, to engage in some military expedition against the possessions of Spain on the Mississippi — to set out from Kentucky."[12] One week later he wrote to General Wayne informing him of the receipt of this letter and of the fact that he had notified Governor Shelby of it — "in order that he might take such measures to prevent it, as he judged proper." On January 6, 1794, acting upon this advice, General Wayne wrote to Governor Shelby, placing at his disposal the squadron of horse, stationed between Georgetown and Lexington and under the command of Major W. Winston, for use in suppressing the French expedition.[13]

It is difficult to arrive at an exact estimate, for a period of so remote a date, of the complexion of the popular mind in a given circumstance and the precise motives which prompted men to decisive action. There is no reason to doubt that many of the leaders of Kentucky, including Shelby — as evidenced by his letter of January 13, 1794, printed below — felt very violently against Spain and very warmly towards France. To these irascible and hot-blooded patriots dwelling upon the western waters, that country which kept closed to their produce and free traffic the great highway, the Mississippi river, was nothing less than an enemy country. In an address (December 13, 1793), "To

[12] Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 102.

[13] Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 524.

the inhabitants of the United States west of the Allegany and Apalachian Mountains," issued by the Democratic society of Lexington, signed by John Breckinridge, chairman, and attested by Thomas Todd and Thomas Bodley, clerks, the claim to the right of navigation of the Mississippi is put forward in vigorous and forceful terms. It is proposed that societies be formed in convenient districts in every part of the western country, by means of which the public may inform themselves of the situation and consult upon measures for securing their desires. The address concludes with these significant words: "We may for a while exhaust our wealth and strength — but until the all-important object is procured, we pledge ourselves to you; and let us all pledge ourselves to each other; that our perseverance and our friendship, will be inexhaustible."[14] Of a far more inflammable nature was a contribution styled "The Crisis" and signed "An old fashioned REPUBLICAN." According to the writer, nothing in the way of redress was to be hoped for from the national government. As to the free navigation of the Mississippi, "its procurement depends solely on ourselves; and this, my fellow citizens, this is the critical moment. Such a conjecture of favourable circumstances, seems to be designed by providence for the completion of this event. We view at the same harmless distance the conflict of English, French and American councils and intrigues, as we do the piracies of the Algerines. We are invulnerable to the offensive operations of the universe. The Spaniards, altho' beneath our contempt, if in the full exercise of their power, have sufficient employment beyond the Atlantic. Louisiana groaning under tyranny, is imploring you with uplifted hands." The article closes with the following apostrophe, presumably addressed to revolutionary leaders, among whom George Rogers Clark and Isaac Shelby were numbered: "To those remaining veteran patriots therefore, whose footsteps we followed to this distant desert, and who by their blood and toil, have converted it into a smiling and delightful country, we now look up. Under your guidance, we fought, we bled, and acquired this country; and under your guidance we still wish to fight and bleed, while any appendage to its complete enjoyment remains to be procured. Strength, courage and firmness are now at your

[14] This address was put in evidence by Judge Harry Innes in the case of Sebastian. Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 109 ff.

service, ready to be directed by your experience and wisdom. Our lives and our fortunes, we are free to hazzard in the attempt, and so long as we can wield a sword, or raise a shilling, they shall, if you lead the way, be devoted to the procurement of this right."[15] While the membership of the Democratic clubs and societies is not fully known, certain it is that many prominent men, among whom were included a number of Shelby's friends, were members of these organizations. It soon was plain enough to Shelby that the temper of the people at this time was very inflammable; and he preferred to adopt a Fabian policy of "watchful waiting," rather than to employ an aggressive policy of military suppression.

With reference to the situation which had developed by an early date in January, 1794, Shelby himself has made an explicit statement. "The subject now became serious and interesting, and required the most attentive consideration; for although I felt no apprehensions that the intended expedition could be carried into effect, yet I entertained too high a sense of the obligations due to the General Government, to refuse the exercise of any powers with which I was clearly invested. After the most careful examination of the subject, I was doubtful whether under the constitution and laws of my country, I possessed powers so extensive as those which I was called upon to exercise."[16] Doubtless Shelby referred the investigation as to the legal status of the case to his secretary of state, James Brown, who was a member of the Democratic society of Lexington; but the dates of the letters exchanged between the two, which have been preserved, indicate that Brown concurred with the views of the governor, rather than that Shelby merely accepted the legal advice of his secretary of state.

In order to understand fully the issues in this controversy, as well as the position taken by Governor Shelby, it is necessary to print in full his famous letter of January 13, 1794, to the secretary of state of the United States:

[15] *Kentucky Gazette*, February 8, 1794.

[16] This statement was made by Governor Shelby in a message to the house of representatives of Kentucky, November 15, 1794, in compliance with a resolution from that body requesting him to lay before them such information as he might have received relative to the free use of the Mississippi river. Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 524 ff.

Sir:

After the date of my last letter to you, I received information that a commission had been sent to General Clark, with powers to name and commission other officers, and to raise a body of men; no steps having been taken by him (as far as has come to my knowledge) to carry this plan into execution, I did not conceive it was either proper or necessary for me to do anything in the business.

Two Frenchmen, Lachaise and Delpeau have lately come into this State; I am told they declare publicly, they are in daily expectation of receiving a supply of money, and that as soon as they do receive it, they shall raise a body of men and proceed with them down the river. Whether they have any sufficient reason to expect to get such a supply, or any serious intention of applying in that manner if they do receive it, I can form no opinion.

I judge it proper, as the President has directed you to write to me on the subject, to give you this information that he may be apprised as fully as I am of the steps which have been and are now taking here in this matter. If the President should hereafter think it necessary to hold any further communication with the Executive of this State on this subject, I wish him to be full and explicit as to the part which he wishes and expects me to act. That if, what is required of me, should in my opinion, be within my constitutional powers, and in the line of my duty I may hereafter have it in my power to shew that the steps which I may take were not only within my legal powers, but were also required by him.

I have great doubts even if they do attempt to carry their plan into execution (provided they manage their business with prudence) whether there is any legal authority to restrain or punish them, at least before they have actually accomplished it. For if it is lawful for any one citizen of this State to leave it, it is equally so for any number of them to do it. It is also lawful for them to carry with them any quantity of provisions, arms and ammunition; and if the act is lawful in itself, there is nothing but the particular intention with which it is done that can possibly make it unlawful, but I know of no law which inflicts a punishment on intention only, or any criterion by which to decide what would be sufficient evidence of that intention, if it was a proper subject of a legal censure.

I shall upon all occasions, be averse to the exercise of any power which I do not consider myself as being clearly and explicitly invested with, much less would I assume power to exercise it against men who I consider as friends and brethren, in favor of a man whom I view as an enemy and a tyrant. I shall

also feel but little inclination to take an active part in punishing or restraining any of my fellow citizens for a supposed intention, only to gratify or remove the fears of the ministers of a foreign prince who openly withholds from us an invaluable right, and who secretly instigates against us a most savage and cruel enemy.

But whatever may be my private opinion, as a man, as a friend to liberty, an American citizen, and an inhabitant of the Western Waters, I shall at all times hold it as my duty to perform whatever may be constitutionally required of me as Governor of Kentucky, by the President of the United States. . . .

ISAAC SHELBY.[17]

This letter is extraordinary in many respects as coming from a governor of an American state and addressed to the general government. Far from pretending to conceal his true feelings and sympathies behind the mask of official aloofness from a conspiracy hatching before his very eyes, the blunt, outspoken governor vehemently takes sides and frankly serves notice on Jefferson that personally and individually as a representative of sentiment among the inhabitants on the "western waters," he is in hearty sympathy with George Rogers Clark and with the movement, engineered by Genet, which Clark is preparing to head. Moreover, this letter stands out in sharp contrast to Shelby's former letter (October 5, 1793) to the secretary of state. In a letter to General M. D. Hardin (July 1, 1812), Governor Shelby gives the following explanation of the apparent discrepancy between the tone and purport of the two letters. "There is to be sure some inconsistency between my two letters to the Secretary of State of the United States, and I saw it at the time, but at the date of the last, I saw evidently that the whole scheme of Lachaise would fall to the ground without any interference, and that the present was a favourable one, while the apprehensions of the President were greatly excited, to express to him what I knew to be the general sentiments of the Kentucky people, relative to the navigation of the Mississippi and the Spanish Government . . ."[18] There seems to be no doubt that Governor

[17] *Kentucky Gazette*, July 19, 1794.

[18] This letter was called forth, during Shelby's campaign for the governorship of Kentucky, by a letter signed "Warren" in the *American statesman*, June 27, 1812, which Shelby declared contained a "garbled statement of official documents, and such a misrepresentation of my conduct, as makes it my duty to place that trans-

Shelby has clearly fallen into error, after the lapse of years, in his assertion that on January 13, 1794, he was assured of the failure of the Franco-American expedition against Louisiana—unless indeed he possessed a prophetic vision, based on reliable sources of "inside information" available to but few. For at this very time, General George Rogers Clark was extensively circulating throughout Kentucky his "Proposals for raising the volunteers, &c."; and so favorably were these "Proposals" received by the public that they were actually set forth, in full, in the *Centinel of the North-Western Territory*, Cincinnati, January 25, 1794, as follows:

George R. Clark, Esq.
Major General in the armies of France, and Commander in Chief of the French Revolutionary Legions on the Mississippi River.

PROPOSALS

For raising the volunteers for the reduction of the Spanish posts on the Mississippi, for opening the trade of the said river, & giving freedom to its inhabitants, &c.

All persons serving the expedition to be entitled to one thousand acres of Land—those that engage for one year, will be entitled to two thousand acres—if they serve two years or during the present war with France, they will have three thousand acres of any unappropriated Land that may be conquered. The officers in proportion pay &c as other French troops. All lawful Plunder to be equally divided agreeable to the custom of War. All necessaries will be provided for the enterprise, and every precaution taken to cause the return of those who wish to quit the service, as comfortable as possible, and a reasonable number of days allowed them to return, at the expiration of which time their pay will cease. All persons will be commissioned agreeable to the number of men they bring into the field. Those that serve the expedition will have their choice of receiving their lands or one dollar a day.

G. R. CLARK.[19]

It was not until February 10 that Governor Shelby replied to the letter of General Wayne of January 6, preceding. In it he says: "I can assure you that there is not the smallest probability that such an enterprise will be attempted; if it should,

action in its proper light." Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 528 ff.

[19] Quoted in the *Kentucky Gazette*, February 4, 1794.

the Militia of this State, I am fully persuaded, are able and willing to suppress every attempt that can be made here to violate the laws of the Union."[20] It is difficult to understand, looking at the events after the lapse of a century and a quarter, how Shelby could have had access to sources of information so positive, to the effect that the French enterprise would not even be attempted. Can it be true that Clark's freebooting expedition, in which he vied in violation of law and government with the buccaneers of the Spanish main, was after all only a colossal "bluff"? Contrary to Shelby's statement, quoted above, it appears certain that it was a matter of general, and even public knowledge that preparations for the piratical enterprise were well under way; and the projectors of the enterprise were so emboldened by the favorable sentiment in Kentucky that Lachaise and Depeau had the temerity to address the governor on the subject, and General Clark sent forth openly and broadcast his "Proposals for raising the volunteers &c." which doubtless were read by Governor Shelby. As a matter of fact, the text of the "Proposals" was printed at Lexington in the *Kentucky Gazette* six days prior to the date of Shelby's letter to Wayne, cited above. There is something equivocal, also, in his reassuring assertions to Wayne; for as early as a month prior to this date he had expressed his doubt as to the existence of law on the statute books under which the courts could arrest the projected enterprise.

The actual fact would seem to be that Governor Shelby deliberately declined every invitation or proposal made to him by the general government, either directly or through St. Clair and Wayne, to act upon his own unsupported authority as governor of Kentucky—either by invoking legal aid or military force. His ultimatum, as delivered to the president of the United States, practically amounted to this: I can find no law which empowers me to stop this expedition. If you wish it stopped legally, pass a national law that will cover the case. Moreover, I decline to call out the state militia to suppress by force an enterprise which may never materialize into action; for premature or ill-advised action will agitate and inflame public sentiment in this state. If you want me to suppress the enterprise

[20] Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 524.

by force, command me to do so under the constitution and I will carry out such constitutional command. My personal sympathies are whole-heartedly on the side of France and bitterly against Spain. I warn you now of this significant circumstance: the people on the western waters are aroused against Spain and are uncompromising in their demands for such negotiation with Spain as will lead to the opening of the Mississippi river.

What was the actual outcome of Shelby's recalcitrant and defiant attitude toward the general government in this whole matter? From his letter of January 13, 1794, flowed certain important consequences. In the first place, an "act in addition to the act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States" was brought before congress, which declared "that to embark in an enterprize, such as was contemplated by the citizens of this State, should be considered as criminal, and directing what punishment should be inflicted on those who should be guilty of such an offence."[21] Edmund Randolph wrote Shelby a lengthy letter (March 29, 1794), in which he said: "As these unlawful assemblages of military force may assume various forms, Congress have not been unmindful, that the civil arm may sometimes be unequal to the task of sustaining civil authority. They have therefore, by an act of May the 2d 1792, conferred on the marshals and their deputies, the same power in executing the laws of the United States, as sheriffs and their deputies in the several states have by law in executing the laws of their respective states. They have rendered it lawful for the President, in case of invasion to call forth the militia, or to issue his orders for that purpose to such officer of the militia as he shall think proper. They have empowered him to call forth the militia of one state for the suppression of an insurrection in another, under certain circumstances, and to subdue by the militia any combination against the laws which may be too powerful for ordinary judicial proceedings."[22] Randolph's letter, which on the whole was rather lame, entirely failed to convince Shelby, whose mind was fully made up and sentiments strongly engaged; and in his message to the house of representatives,

[21] From Shelby's message to the house of representatives of Kentucky. Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 524 ff.

[22] *Kentucky Gazette*, July 26, 1794.

cited above, he asserts: "From the necessity of passing that law [above referred to], I infer that my doubts as to the criminality of the proposed enterprize were well founded, and that until the passage of that law (June 5, 1794), the offence had not been declared nor the punishment defined."

It is clear that the president, on the basis of Shelby's letter of January 13, 1794, feared that Shelby in his capacity as governor of Kentucky was strongly disposed against taking drastic action, either legal or military, in suppressing the projected freebooting expedition. Accordingly, taking the matter into his own hands, he issued a proclamation (March 24, 1794), declaring: "Whereas I have received information that certain persons in violation of the laws, have presumed, under color of a foreign authority, to enlist citizens of the United States and others within the State of Kentucky, and have there assembled an armed force for the purpose of invading and plundering the territory of a nation at peace with the United States . . . I have therefore thought proper to issue this proclamation, hereby solemnly warning every person not authorized by the laws, against enlisting any citizen or citizens of the United States for the purpose aforesaid, or proceeding in any manner to the execution thereof, as they will answer the same at their peril."[23] Washington took the additional step of directing General Wayne to "establish a strong military post at Fort Massac on the Ohio, and prevent by force, if necessary, the descent of any hostile party down that river."[24]

The recall of Genet, which had been effected through diplomatic channels, together with Washington's strong proclamation, dealt the final blows to the hopes of Clark, Lachaise, and their adherents. The gravity of the situation, and the danger which had been averted, are exhibited in a letter which Lachaise wrote to the Democratic society of Lexington (in May, 1794), in which he says that "causes unforeseen had put a stop to the march of two thousand brave Kentuckians, who were about to go and put an end to the Spanish despotism on the Mississippi, where Frenchmen and Kentuckians, united under the banners

[23] *Kentucky Gazette*, May 3, 1794.

[24] William H. English, *Conquest of the country northwest of the river Ohio, 1778-1783; and life of General George Rogers Clark* (Indianapolis, 1896), 2: 822; Robert M. McElroy, *Kentucky in the nation's history* (New York, 1909), 174.

of France, might have made one nation, the happiest in the world — so perfect was their sympathy."[25]

In an "Address to the Freemen of Kentucky," issued in the summer of 1812, during his campaign for the governorship, Shelby declared that he wrote his letter of January 13, 1794, having in view as one principal object to alarm the general government regarding the western people and their excited state over the question of the navigation of the Mississippi. "The attention of the General Government being thus drawn to the Western country, I deemed it a favorable time to make an impression on their minds of the importance of the navigation of the Mississippi, and of the necessity attending to that subject. *On that account and with that object*, my letter of the 13th January, 1794, was calculated rather to increase than to diminish the apprehensions of the General Government as to the Western country. This letter had the effect desired, it drew from the Secretary of State information in relation to the navigation of the Mississippi, and satisfied us that the General Government was, in good faith, pursuing this object of first importance to the people of Kentucky. The information thus drawn forth quieted the public mind and restored harmony to the country."[26]

A more explicit setting forth of all the negotiations is requisite for a full understanding of the subject. In his letter to Shelby of March 29, 1794, Edmund Randolph wrote: "In December, 1791, it was verbally communicated to the Secretary of State by one of the Commissioners of Spain here, that his Catholic Majesty, apprised of our solicitude to have some arrangements made respecting our free navigation of the Mississippi, and the use of a port thereon, was ready to enter into a treaty at Madrid. . . Instructions, comprehensive, accurate and forcible were prepared by my predecessor; and if at this stage of the business, it were proper to develop them to public view, I should expect with certainty, that those who are the most ardent for the main object would pronounce that the executive has been deficient neither in vigilance nor exertions."[27]

The pressure of public sentiment, aroused by the pronunciamentos of the Lexington Democratic society, at length took form

[25] Marshall, *History of Kentucky*, 2: 125.

[26] Butler, *History of the commonwealth of Kentucky*, appendix, 531.

[27] *Kentucky Gazette*, July 26, 1794.

in the following action by the general assembly of Kentucky (December 20, 1794): "Resolved, that the senators in Congress be and they are hereby instructed to require information of the steps which have been taken to obtain the navigation of the river Mississippi and to transmit such information to the Executive of this State."[28] On November 24, preceding, Thomas Pinckney had been commissioned by the federal government as envoy to Madrid, with instructions to negotiate a treaty securing the free navigation of the Mississippi. And further to allay the excitement in Kentucky, the senate of the United States passed a resolution providing: "That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, requested to cause to be communicated to the Executive of the State of Kentucky, such part of the existing negotiation between the United States and Spain, relative to this subject, as he may deem advisable and consistent with the negotiations."[29]

In pursuance of this resolution, the president appointed James Innes "a Special Commissioner to detail a faithful history of the negotiations pending between the United States and the Court of Madrid respecting the navigation of the Mississippi." An exhaustive analysis of the negotiations was made by the special commissioner and transmitted to Governor Shelby.[30] The crux of the matter is contained in the special commissioner's statement that the president had decided not to "enter into any commercial relations with the Court of Madrid 'until our right to the free use of the Mississippi shall be most unequivocally acknowledged and established, on principles never hereafter to be drawn into contestation.'"

The subsequent incidents in the history of this important issue, the further Spanish intrigues engineered by Carondelet, the diplomatic negotiations, are beyond the scope of the present inquiry. Suffice it to say that on March 30, 1798, the Spanish troops evacuated the posts north of the boundary, the thirty-first meridian, established by the treaty; and at last "the pioneers of the West found themselves in the possession of the long

[28] *Kentucky Gazette*, February 7, 1795.

[29] *Ibid.*, March 14, 1795.

[30] This report, with accompanying documents, appeared in the *Kentucky Gazette* for March 14, 1795.

coveted right of freely navigating the great river, which formed their only highway to the markets of the world."

Isaac Shelby has been the target for severe criticism and bitter invective because of his stand in the matter of the Franco-American expedition and his apparent readiness to allow American neutrality to be violated and the United States compromised. Shelby was bitterly attacked in 1812 by his enemy, Humphrey Marshall, who afterwards renewed the attack most vehemently in his *History of Kentucky* in 1824. The documents herein cited and the course of Shelby's actions tell their own story. When it is considered that the ultimate result of Shelby's famous letter of January 13, 1794, and of his subsequent acts was the opening to navigation of the Mississippi river, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this important accomplishment outweighed the fault of alleged lukewarmness in devotion to the national government which Shelby evidenced in declining to order the arrest of Clark, Lachaise, Depeau, and other leaders of the projected freebooting expedition.

Archibald Henderson

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

STEAMBOATING ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AFTER THE CIVIL WAR: A MISSISSIPPI MAGNATE[1]

Taking as admitted the initial depressing effect of the civil war upon Mississippi river steamboating, the period of recovery during the sixties and seventies, and the decline, first gradual and then speedy, which came in the eighties,[2] the purpose of this paper is to trace something of this rise and fall in the experiences of a man who was undoubtedly the outstanding figure of upper river boating for nearly a generation. Even today this man's name is anathema to many if not most of the rivermen who periodically foregather to eat in memory of better days, and who garner elusive items about the *Itasca*, the *Northern Light*, or one of the numerous *Eagles* famed in river lore.

Back in 1854 there appeared in St. Paul with a little boat which he had brought around from Pittsburgh William F. Davidson,[3] familiarly known in later years as "Commodore."

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Louis, May 8, 1919.

[2] The *Winona Independent* of March 2, 1919, contains a tabular statement, compiled at the office of the city engineer, showing the boats, barges, and rafts which passed the Northwestern bridge each year from 1879 to 1918 inclusive. While these figures are illuminating they have to be used with caution, since the absolute numbers are not the only criteria of the health of steamboating. According to these figures there was a steady increase in the number from 1879, when 3,372 boats and 1,350 barges were listed, to 1885, when they were, respectively, 5,126 and 848. From 1886 to 1889 there was an average of some 4,500 boats; 1890 saw 5,417 boats and 1,045 barges; the next year there was a decline in the number of boats, but in 1892 the high water mark of 5,468 was reached. From 1893 to 1900 the number fluctuated about the 4000 mark. The year 1901 produced a sharp falling off; 1902 had a slight recovery, and thereafter it is a tale of rapid decline until in 1918 only 295 boats passed this point and the number of barges was even smaller. Incidentally a vivid commentary on the lumber trade of the upper Mississippi and its affluents is contained in the number of rafts passing Winona: in 1884, 2,700 log rafts were floated down; in 1915 there were three, and none have been seen in the past four seasons.

[3] George B. Merrick and William R. Tibbals, "Genesis of steam navigation on western rivers," in Wisconsin historical society, *Proceedings*, 1911, p. 125. By an old raft captain, who knew the river for more than sixty years, the writer was told in emphatic tones that no person or event had done more to ruin upper river steamboating than Commodore Davidson. This sentiment is reiterated in more than one of the printed records.

The son of an Ohio canal boat man, he had been brought up on the river, and was captain of a steamboat at the age of twenty. With the *Franklin Steele*, his little stern-wheeler, he began carrying freight on the Minnesota river, running up to Mankato, and sometimes when water favored as far as New Ulm. Since his rates were considerably below those of the then "king of the Minnesota river," Louis Robert, farmers came with their ox-carts for miles to get the supplies which Davidson dumped upon the river bank on his way up, and left their grain for him to carry down on his return trip. So rapidly did the enterprise grow that he added the *Favorite* the next season and by 1859 had in all five boats in operation.

It was in this latter year that Davidson extended his operations to a wider field of activity. The Milwaukee and La Crosse railroad, sharing the fate of many railroads of the fifties, went into the hands of a receiver, who appointed one Harvey Rumsey agent of the railroad at La Crosse.[4] Now it appears that Rumsey found in existence between the railroad and the Galena, Dubuque, Dunleith, and Minnesota packet company[5]—the monopolistic octopus of the upper river carrying trade at the time—an arrangement by which the steamboat company had the exclusive handling of all freight and passengers brought to the railhead, and almost as complete a control of commodities destined to be turned over to the road to be transported to the east. Accordingly Rumsey requested the privilege of securing some stock in the "Galena company," a request which seems to have been courteously entertained but finally refused; thereupon Rumsey approached Davidson with an offer to turn all business to him if he would put on a regular line between St. Paul and La Crosse, to which point Davidson had run somewhat irregularly a connecting boat in the interest of his Minnesota river line.

[4] Russell Blakeley, "Advent of commerce in Minnesota," in *Minnesota historical collections*, 8: 408.

[5] This line, which is variously referred to as the "Minnesota packet company" and the "Galena line," illustrates the manner in which most of the steamboat companies grew. After a continued strife between two loosely organized groups of river men there was formed, in the winter of 1852-1853, the Galena and Minnesota packet company. In 1855 the company entered a wider field and embraced a larger group of men as the Galena, Dunleith, and Minnesota packet company. In 1857 it absorbed a newly organized potential rival, the Dubuque and Minnesota packet company, and became the Galena, Dubuque, Dunleith, and Minnesota packet company. Blakeley, "Advent of commerce in Minnesota," *ibid.*, 8: 389, 404, 492.

The invitation was accepted, and for a time the interloper received all the accommodation which had hitherto been extended to the old company. The latter, however, was unwilling to be driven out without a murmur and there followed a merry river war in which for a time freight was carried up the river from La Crosse for nothing, while a passenger could go from St. Paul, or anywhere between there and La Crosse, to Milwaukee and Chicago for one dollar. No one was making any money, hence before long the trustees of the bondholders of the railroad intervened and put a stop to the new agreement.

Davidson, however, had definitely entered the Mississippi river, and despite the loss of his exclusive privileges continued to run the boats of his La Crosse and St. Paul steam packet company[6] in competition with the Galena, or Minnesota company as it was sometimes called, and with such "wild" boats as tried to remain in the game. In 1862 some of the men who had been foremost in establishing the Galena line, some ten years before, withdrew from the river, leaving another group in control. From the latter Davidson acquired an interest in the old line, at the same time buying some of its boats to add to his La Crosse line.[7] Curious observers, as well as dissatisfied minority stockholders of the Minnesota line, perceived that the *Northern Belle* bore the white collar of Davidson's packets when she came up the river to St. Paul that season.

The minority owners of the Minnesota line, who felt that they had been sold out by their friends, continued to run another season, and then, in 1864, engineered a reorganization under the name of the Dubuque, Prairie du Chien, and St. Paul railroad packet company, or, as it was better known, the Northwestern line.[8] Ostensibly Davidson's White Collar line and the North-

[6] J. Fletcher Williams, in his "History of the city of St. Paul and of the county of Ramsey, Minnesota," *Minnesota historical collections*, 4: 396, states among his items for the year 1860: "This season, Capt. DAVIDSON started a line of packets from St. Paul to La Crosse, with three small boats, and this laid the foundation of his present marine corporation."

[7] Blakeley intimates that the minority group was rather shabbily treated by the men who sold out to Davidson.

[8] George B. Merrick, "Steamboats and steamboat men on the upper Mississippi," in Burlington, Iowa, *Saturday Evening Post*, January 23, 1915. William E. Wellington of Dubuque was superintendent, a principal stockholder, and by far the most important individual of the Northwestern packet company. The organization was

western were rivals for the trade of the upper river, the former confining itself to the trade north of La Crosse, and the latter reaching as far south as Dubuque and Dunleith, where it had a working agreement with the Illinois Central just as at Prairie du Chien it had the exclusive handling of the business of the Milwaukee and Prairie du Chien. As a matter of fact, however, a hard and fast pool had been arranged by which the gross earnings of the two companies were paid into a common fund to be divided at the end of the season. It appears that the stockholders of the Northwestern had some difficulty in securing their portion: as reported by one who was financially interested, "He [Davidson] was a shrewd unscrupulous man and had a faculty by which he could deceive most men and make them his willing tools. For ways that were dark and trickery, he would beat the heathen Chinee."[9]

The earnings of the combination were very large when considered in terms of capital invested. It was not at all strange that this should be the case, when one takes account of the summary manner in which competition was dealt with. A "wild" boat had about as much chance in the trade of the upper river and its branches as a lamb has nowadays among the veterans of Wall street. The experience of a little boat which attempted to brave the wrath of the monopolists by attempting to secure some of the carrying trade between La Crosse and points on the St. Croix river presents a case typical of others. The *Viola* was

chartered under the laws of Iowa with a cash capital of $400,000. It continued to maintain the traffic arrangements of the old Galena line.

[9] S. W. McMaster, *Sixty years on the upper Mississippi, my life and experiences* (Rock Island, 1893), 186. McMaster recounts the steps in the transaction thus: "Commodore Davidson . . . commenced running from LaCrosse to St. Paul, carrying freight and passengers at the same rates apparently, but he had a secret understanding with the railroad, by which he gave them a draw back on the business. . . The next season the Packet Co. made an agreement with him taking forty thousand dollars stock in the La Crosse line, putting on one or two of their boats. The La Crosse railroad being the shortest line from Chicago to Minnesota got the largest share of the immense traffic that was coming from the east to Minnesota. At the next annual meeting of the stockholders of the Packet Co., at Dunleith, Davidson sent no report of the earnings of that part of the line. Two of our number were appointed a committee to go to La Crosse and have Davidson render an account. It was well known that the net earnings had been near $200,000. When the delegates returned they reported that he would pay over to the company $135,000 as the earnings. This amount was accepted. It turned out that our delegates had agreed to go in with Davidson in this line."

put on a regular run in the expectation that her owners would receive from the Milwaukee and La Crosse railroad the six cents per bushel drawback allowed the White Collar and the Northwestern lines for all wheat delivered to the railhead. Nevertheless, before it was possible for the intruders to collect the accrued amount of some $4500 they were forced into an agreement with Davidson to withdraw from the river. The defeated independents, however, attempted to evade their bargain by selling out to another group, which immediately started operations again. This trick Davidson stopped with an injunction.[10]

The close of the civil war saw Davidson well entrenched in the carrying trade of the upper river. He was chief owner and real manager of the La Crosse and St. Paul steam packet company, the White Collar line; he owned stock in and had a pooling arrangement with the Dubuque, Prairie du Chien, and St. Paul railroad packet company, the Northwestern line. So nearly like a monopoly was the result that the "anti-monopoly revolt" of 1865 and 1866, insofar as it affected Wisconsin and Minnesota, viewed Davidson and his associates as menaces to actual and potential prosperity, second, if to anything, only to the railroads of Wisconsin and Illinois.

It is difficult to estimate with even approximate accuracy the relative influence of a legitimate economic grievance and the interplay of political forces in the agitation which culminated in the anti-monopoly convention which met in St. Paul in February, 1866. The following facts, however, appear.

In the spring of 1865 the *St. Paul Press* began in its editorials to attack the railroad and steamboat "monopolies" which were bearing heavily upon the people of the upper river. Soon the assault was suspended, because, as the editor later explained, he was away in the east a considerable portion of the summer and on his return found his attention completely engrossed in an exciting political campaign.[11] On November 8, 1865, the subscribers to the *St. Paul Pioneer* were astonished to find upon the front page of their favorite journal a brief farewell note

[10] *St. Paul Pioneer*, February 2, 1866. This incident was brought out before the anti-monopoly convention at St. Paul. Davidson, who was present, merely stated that the owners of the *Viola* had attempted to crawl out of a business agreement and he had sued out an injunction to make them abide by their bargain.

[11] *St. Paul Press*, January 18, 1866.

from the retiring editor, Earle S. Goodrich, and a salutation from John X. Davidson and Harlan P. Hall, entitled "OUR PLATFORM."[12] The astonishment of the readers must have been deeply tinged with chagrin, for the *Pioneer* had been the leading democratic organ of the region, and now they read, "The undersigned having purchased the entire printing establishment connected with this paper, the St. Paul Pioneer will hereafter be published as an INDEPENDENT Union journal." Well might the *Press*, in commenting on the sale, opine that the transaction, which had occurred four days before its announcement in the *Pioneer*, was an indication of a surrender in advance of the election to their "black republican" enemies.[13] "We cannot help thinking," it went on, "that this transfer of the Democrat organ to Republican hands, on the eve of an important political contest is a poor return for the unnumbered favors and lavish support which its proprietors have received from the Democratic party for the last twelve years."

While only the names of Harlan P. Hall and John X. Davidson, a nephew of the commodore, appeared as proprietors of the *Pioneer* under its new management, it was well known that William F. Davidson had supplied the greater portion of the purchase money. No particular fact appeared for the following fortnight or so which seemed to lend any significance to the transaction. It is interesting, however, to read what must have reflected Commodore Davidson's views of the future of steamboating, as they appear in the course of an article reviewing the season on the river:

It is frequently asserted that when our grand system of railroads is completed, the steamboat trade of this port will greatly decrease. There are many who predict otherwise, however, and with good grounds — for the railroads create a business exclusively their own, and instances are very numerous where railroads running along a navigable stream have failed to drive off the steamboats.

The carrying trade must always be one in which railroads cannot compete with steamers — the latter being enabled to take freight at so much cheaper rates. In the vast produce exporting trade of this country in future years, the steamboat will un-

[12] *St. Paul Pioneer*, November 8, 1865.

[13] *St. Paul Press*, November 7, 1865. See also Daniel S. B. Johnston, "Journalism in the territorial period," *Minnesota historical collections*, 8: 257.

doubtedly have its full share of business. It is impossible to prophesy the course of trade, but it seems not too much to say that our city will in the future reap as much benefit from her position at the head of navigation on the Mississippi as she was in the past.[14]

On the same day on which Davidson's paper was summing up the accomplishments on the river for the season, the *St. Paul Press* opened again its campaign against river and rail monopolies by quoting with favorable comment an excerpt from the Hudson, Wisconsin, *Star and Times* in which the steamboat companies came in for particular attention:

Not only have the combinations to which we have alluded, increased passage and freightage to the most exhorbitant rates, charging as high and even higher on wheat and flour to La Crosse, than was charged to St. Paul before the war, and even more on up freights, but they have sought by means unjust and illegitimate, to control the carrying trade of the river by summarily choking off all opposition. . . .

Those of you who innocently imagine that the Mississippi

[14] *St. Paul Pioneer,* November 30, 1865. The rise of the White Collar line as depicted in this review is interesting: "This organization was formed in 1860 by Capt. W. F. Davidson and P. S. Davidson. They had previously been running the Frank Steele and Favorite on the Minnesota River, and withdrew them, forming, with the Wenona, a daily line to La Crosse. In the face of formidable rivalry, the new line succeeded, mainly through the well known energy of its President, Capt. W. F. Davidson, and in five seasons has grown into one of the largest steamboat companies on any of the Western rivers. It now owns and runs twenty boats and forty-seven barges, and employs nearly 2000 men in various capacities. The company also have an extensive ship yard at La Crosse, where a large gang of men are constantly at work building new boats or repairing old ones. This year the company has added sixteen barges to its list, each capable of holding 7,000 bushels, in order to accommodate their large grain trade. A private telegraph office is sustained by the company on the levee, merely to aid in directing and managing the movements of such a fleet of boats."

The same article refers in somewhat contemptuous terms to the Northwestern line, and credits it with "eleven packets and about twenty barges, and employing about one thousand men in various capacities." The *St. Paul Press,* a few days later (December 5, 1865), in its review of the season enumerates the barges and lighters as follows:

Northwestern packet company	55
The La Crosse and St. Paul packet company	42
St. Louis and Savannah lines estimated	20
Wood barges on the Minnesota	12

It then adds the comment: "Our impetuous contemporary being owned by a rival steamboat interest, represents the number of barges owned by the Northwestern Company at 20. The above figures are derived from the agent of the Company."

river is free to lawful commerce, are much mistaken. The managers of the two railroads leading from your city [Milwaukee] to the Mississippi river, seem to have decreed, and are inexorable in the execution of their mandate, that no boats shall run on the upper river except those belonging to the consolidated Packet Companies. No other boat can land its freight at their depots and elevators, except at a discrimination against it alike unjust and ruinous.

It was pointed out that through freights to Milwaukee were 28 cents per bushel of wheat and 80 cents per barrel of flour; of this the regular boats received 10 cents on the wheat and 30 cents on the flour. Moreover, an independent boat was charged 6 cents a bushel on wheat and 28 cents a barrel on flour more than a regular boat for transportation from La Crosse or Prairie du Chien to Milwaukee.

For two months, that is, during December and January, the *Press* followed up its attack upon monopolies and especially upon the steamboat combination. It charged Davidson with distorting facts relative to the cost of running his boats.[15] It pointed out that two or three years previously fifteen cents per bushel for transportation of wheat from St. Paul to Milwaukee was considered extortionate, while for the previous season the rate had been thirty-five cents.[16] This, it was contended, enabled "the President of one of our Packet Companies" to buy large quantities of wheat up the Minnesota valley at a low price because the high freight rate scared away competitive buyers, and allowed him to put it in Milwaukee at a profit of from fifty to sixty per cent.

Other papers took up the cry. Letters to the editor on the evils of all monopolies and steamboat monopolies in particular were seldom excluded because of lack of space,[17] and editorial comment called attention to the spiciest ones.

[15] *St. Paul Press*, December 5, 1865.

[16] *Ibid.*, December 12, 1865.

[17] John W. Haines, of Dakota county, was one of the most active in the anti-monopoly agitation, both with his pen and otherwise. In one letter, *ibid.*, December 14, 1865, after showing how "Commodore Davidson and Lord Wellington's Company" extorted the profits of the farmer, Haines stated that one man told him that the merchants of St. Paul had an understanding with Davidson by which merchandise rates were made lower than to the merchants at Winona. Haines asked, "Why don't the papers cry out?" "He looked at me with a peculiar look and answered, Davidson lives here, he has money, *The Press*, or *Pioneer* would not dare to say a word against the Commodore's interests."

Meantime the *Pioneer* at first ridiculed the vehemence of the *Press*.[18] It did little arguing on its own account but was not averse to printing paragraphs from other papers, the editors of which were not seriously alarmed at the *Press'* exposures. The *Minneapolis Atlas*, for instance, took this tone:

It [the *Press*] fairly skinned Davidson alive [during the three previous years] but it performed its operation in such a "funny" way that the "Old Commodore" could not get mad at it or say a word in reply. If the *Press* wanted to "rake the Old Commodore down" as a "monopolist," who was crowding everybody else off the river, it would say:

"The Annie Johnson reached her wharf today on time, notwithstanding the extremely low stage of the water. Capt. Davidson is proving himself a public benefactor by keeping us in touch with the world below, when all other lines have withdrawn their boats."

And the "Old Commodore," smarting under this "stinging rebuke," would, instead of kicking them off his boats when they came aboard, send the *Press* editors a handful of "passes," which they, just to punish him, never sent back. . .

Very late in the season, when the passes run out and the steamboat printing "shuts off," when the "farmers" come to the legislature, and there is State printing to be given out, how it *does* love the farmer![19]

It was with the state printing that the *Pioneer* drew a red herring across the trail. For many years the *Press* had been selected by the republican majority in the legislature as the vehicle for dissemination of authentic transcripts of state laws and other public acts. As between the two papers, then, the campaign was waged on these two issues: the *Press* devoted much space to steamboat monopolies, with occasionally a rejoinder to some telling hit of the *Pioneer*; the *Pioneer* hammered away on the printing "monopoly," pausing now and then to expose what it considered a weak argument from its opponent. Under the circumstances it is not strange that the whole matter

[18] *St. Paul Pioneer*, December 31, 1865. "It required only three weeks after the first issue of the PIONEER under its new management, for the *Press* to discover that there was a hideous transportation monopoly crushing the people of the Northwest, and singularly enough this discovery was coupled with the announcement that the PIONEER was owned and run in the interest of that monopoly. This explanation will throw some light upon the query of the Mankato *Union* whose editor, in his issue of the 22d inst., touches our neighbor on the raw," by asking why it took the *Press* so long to discover the evil.

[19] *St. Paul Pioneer*, January 1, 1866.

came near to degenerating into a personal contest between the two sets of editors.[20] Nevertheless, there appeared to be potential political possibilities in the situation and the new editors were sounded as to their position,[21] without, however, giving much satisfaction to anxious politicians.

[20] On January 18, 1866, the *St. Paul Press*, in answer to a taunt from the *Minneapolis Atlas*, gave its explanation of the whole affair. The real cause of the transaction, it maintained, grew first from a rebuke administered to the *La Crosse Democrat*, a paper supported chiefly by the La Crosse packet company, for its alleged advocacy of the assassination of President Lincoln. Then in the spring of 1865 it denounced the rates charged by the steamboat companies. "Capt. Davidson," it went on, "never forgave us for this assault on his monopoly." Then, during the summer of 1865, when the editor of the *Press* was absent in the east, "a 'relative of Capt. Davidson' was in partial charge of our columns — though the relation was by us then unknown — and of course nothing was said on the subject of 'monopolies.'" Then followed the purchase of the *Pioneer* by Davidson, "with the obvious intention of controlling public opinion in the interest of his monopoly — while his agent in the transaction, in the first enthusiasm of that happy acquisition, announced that he was going to crush out the PRESS, and had money enough to do it.'" The third reason for the purchase, said the *Press*, grew out of an unsuccessful attempt of this "relative" to buy an interest in the *Press*, "and it was, doubtless, because the Commodore failed to subsidize the PRESS, in his indirect and underhand manner, that he resolved to purchase an organ of his own, through which, by a skillful 'crushing out' process, he might hope, in a short time, to acquire as complete a monopoly of the newspaper business of St. Paul, as, by a similar crushing out and cut-throat policy, he had originally built up his steamboat monopoly, and his monopoly of the wheat trade of the Minnesota Valley."

[21] Ignatius Donnelly, then a member of congress from Minnesota, was opposed by a strong faction of the republican party in his district and in the state. Through a friend he had Hall sounded out as to that gentleman's position, and the answer confirmed Hall's original announcement through the columns of the *Pioneer* that he was to be tied to no political faction. Wilson, Donnelly's correspondent, went on to give some good advice: "Recent appearances have inclined me to think you had not better espouse the cause of the Pioneer as against the Press just now, for it looks a good deal as if Col. Averill might be your competitor for the Congressional nomination & he proposed to fight the Press 'with tooth and nail' as I understand. He told me before he went East that he should 'camp on their track' and spare no exertion to thwart their plans & I am informed he still utters threats. Now if he should be around this winter & and endeavor to defeat the Press upon the printing question, it would of course repel that concern, and incline the favorable regard of the Pioneer." W. L. Wilson to Donnelly, December 8, 1865, in Donnelly manuscripts, owned by the Minnesota historical society.

Henry Fletcher, another faithful adherent and adviser of Donnelly, had tried to find the true inwardness of the situation, but he reported, "The sale of the Pioneer as far as I can learn was purely a private business transaction but its consequences will tell largely on political issues in this state. It opens a fine field for a rare fight on the printing question this winter and [one] in which I sincerely hope the Press will come off second best." Fletcher to Donnelly, November 17, 1865, Donnelly manuscripts.

Whatever may have been the original animus of the *Press* in its campaign against the steamboat combination, it succeeded in focusing public attention upon what was felt to be a crying evil. Its reiterated statistics of amount of business, cost of freightage, charges at terminals, coöperation with railroads, and the like, served to make articulate what the farmers of Minnesota and western Wisconsin had been thinking, and so in large measure precipitated there the first of those oft-repeated movements which have characterized the Mississippi valley since the civil war. Along in December, 1865, there came the suggestion of a convention to consider the abuses and to take action.[22] A number of the members of the Minnesota legislature, which assembled early in January, 1866, joined with some St. Paul business men in signing a call for a meeting to arrange for a state convention.[23] This mass meeting was held in the senate chamber of the state capitol.[24] After organizing, it had read an offer from the National steam navigation company of Chicago to run four boats from St. Louis to St. Paul the next season if St. Paul business men would pledge from twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars in support of the venture. The real business of the meeting was the adoption of a series of resolutions calling attention to the steamboat monopoly on the upper Mississippi and inviting the people of that valley and those of the Minnesota valley to send delegates to a convention to be held in St. Paul on the seventh of February; it called upon the Minnesota legislature to invite the Wisconsin legislature to curb the railroad monopolies of that state, and compel them to receive freight on equal terms from all boats. The convention realized that it was

22 The suggestion that the *Press* call a convention was made in a letter from J. W. McClung, of St. Paul, December 21, 1865, but the *Press* editorially expressed its opinion that the call should come from the farmers, the St. Paul board of trade, or some other "respectable body of men."

23 *St. Paul Press,* January 5, 1866.

24 *Ibid.,* January 10, 1866. The meeting was held on the evening of January 9. On the day of the meeting the *Pioneer* dropped this word of wisdom for the enthusiasts: "As such meetings are of little value without practical results, we commend to the consideration the suggestions of the Milwaukee *Wisconsin*, which we publish elsewhere. The *Wisconsin* urges the appointment of committees to confer with the transportation companies upon the subject of freights, and ascertain if relief cannot be had in that direction. This is certainly the simplest method of reaching the matter. Whether it will ultimately prove the best is a question that can be better determined by practice than theory."

the railroads which really held the whip hand, consequently it was inclined to lay great stress upon this factor.

Enthusiastic response met the call for a convention. Meetings were held in all the counties of the state and delegates were selected to go to St. Paul. Even in Wisconsin, so far as the portion tributary to the St. Croix and Mississippi was concerned, state lines were forgotten and support lent to the Minnesota plan, because it would form another attack upon the monopolies which were even then being dealt some hard blows, at least verbally, farther east. It is apparent that the transportation companies feared there might be some fire where all this smoke was rolling up, for a cut was announced in the rate on wheat by the La Crosse railroad; the charge fell from twenty-eight cents per bushel from La Crosse to Milwaukee to eighteen cents. Moreover, it was rumored that the directors of the steamboat companies had been hastily summoned to consider the advisability of lowering rates[25] and even of announcing the dissolution of the pacts with the railroads.[26] All these suggestions the *Press* held up to ridicule, and maintained that they were but old tricks hurriedly brought out to delude the people; it insisted on the remedy it had advocated from the beginning, and that was a combination of the people pledged to boycott the combination of boating interests and to support independent lines. It announced from time to time suggestions made by steamboat men down the river who appeared willing to venture above Keokuk and Dubuque if they could be assured of support. To the allegation that the merchants of St. Paul and other cities of the upper river were not exerting themselves noticeably in the cause, the *Press* brought out rather pointed hints that they did not dare put themselves in opposition to Commodore Davidson and his associates so long as they could not be sure the new movement would succeed.[27]

[25] *St. Paul Press*, January 14, 1866.

[26] *Ibid.*, January 17, 1866.

[27] The *Pioneer*, January 18, 1866, approved all suggestions for more boats in the upper river; competition was the life of trade, and likewise the death of monopoly, it was willing to agree. If all these suggestions from rival lines were made in good faith by men who had means to carry out their propositions, nothing could be more desired. Respecting the innuendoes of the *Press* regarding the business men and merchants, the *Pioneer* said: "The assertions of the *Press* that the merchants are being bought up with steamboat stock, are as base as they are groundless. It is a

On the morning of the convention day, February 7, 1886, the *Pioneer* contained a very temperate comment, flavored, to be sure, with a little editorial condescension; in addition it ran a column of clippings from other papers of which the selection from the *St. Peter Advertiser* is typical:

We are no particular friend of Capt. Davidson, but why this hue and cry should be raised against him because the railroad companies exact enormous freight rates, is hard to explain. As we said last week, the excitement was caused by the *Press* of St. Paul for the reason that one of Captain Davidson's relations is interested in the PIONEER. And further the Captain is not a railroad man; he controls no railroads, and, we presume, does not intend to. His boats, during the season of navigation, run in connection with railroad lines, nothing more.

Who is Captain Davidson that the *Press* asks the people to condemn in public meetings? He is the man, who in 1858, put a line of boats on the Minnesota River, and reduced freights from $1.50 per hundred to 10 cents per Hundred between St. Peter and St. Paul. For many years has he continued to run his boats up this river, and never did we hear him spoken of only in high terms until the *Press* began to growl for something — nothing.

After noting that Davidson had 900,000 bushels of grain in houses rotting, in order that he might attend to the needs of the merchants of the Minnesota valley, the *Advertiser* continued:

Captain Davidson's boats will run up the river next season, and, as ever, he will carry all freight at reasonable prices. To the farmers we will say, that when all other wheat buyers have played out, this "pirate" Davidson will buy your grain, and give the highest going prices. If he chooses to let it rot here, or

'vile bird that fouls its own nest,' and it must be a pleasure to the merchants of St. Paul to see themselves thus branded by a paper which they have liberally sustained, and a direct effort made to drive trade from the city." Among the Donnelly manuscripts there is a statement entitled "Receipts by the La Crosse & Minn St. Pkt Co at La Crosse during the season of navigation of the year 1865 from April 1st to Decr. 1st." Accompanying the statement is a note from William B. Rhodes, secretary of the company, to Donnelly, stating that a copy was being sent to W. B. Allison, member of congress from Iowa. The letter is dated January 27, 1866. The statement itemizes freight carried from St. Paul and eighteen other stations, under the heads of bushels of wheat, barrels of flour, pounds of wool, pounds of ginseng, pounds of hides. The totals of receipts at La Crosse under these heads are, respectively, 2,792,926; 90,490; 300,060; 252,654; 1,375,499. Shipments from La Crosse to points up the river were 16,847 tons of assorted merchandise, 11,876 barrels of salt; 10,320 tons of railroad iron. No indication is given as to why such a statement should be sent to two members of congress at this particular time, but the coincidence is interesting.

is obliged to, in order that the public may be accommodated, that is his fault, or generosity of heart — as you please to have it.[28]

Denizens of St. Paul and delegates in town for the convention, however, could feel when they read the morning paper, even before their meeting, that the agitation in the states of the upper valley had at least brought promises of improvement. At the request of Commodore Davidson both papers carried a letter written by the president of the Milwaukee and La Crosse railroad in answer to a request addressed him by individual members of the Wisconsin legislature, then in session. Mr. Merrill announced that the company had adopted a policy for the future by which it would recognize the principle of an open river so far as freight business was concerned; thereafter the railroad would receive from all water carriers such freight as they might deliver and on the same terms. As for passengers, it must make some sort of arrangement for their accommodation, but so far as possible it would apply the same principle as with freight.[29]

Delegates from twenty-eight Minnesota and four Wisconsin counties convened to consider the evil of monopolies. If there were factious and personal reasons why a leading newspaper had taken up and carried on the agitation, it was a real grievance which these northwestern farmers came together to discuss, and there can be no doubt of the earnestness of their purpose. After organization, which was accompanied by some very plain speaking, "representatives of any existing or proposed lines of transportation to the Northwest" were invited upon the floor to take part in the discussion.[30]

[28] *St. Paul Pioneer*, February 7, 1866. The *Pioneer's* comment, after noting the various promises of new steamboat lines, ended with this sentiment: "While an insane malice has prompted many to engage in this anti-monopoly, we believe the major portion of the convention will be actuated by more honorable motives, and that they will endeavor to take such action as will best advance the interests of the people. Believing also that a sufficient degree of intelligence will be embraced in the Convention to meet the emergency, we leave the 'ready-made' plans for egotistical co-temporaries to present and dilate upon. We would, however, suggest that action should be taken, urging upon Congress the importance of immediately improving the Upper Mississippi."

[29] The *Press*, February 7, 1866, said this was a fair promise but it much preferred to have the thing made sure by act of the legislature.

[30] Very full accounts are found in both the *Pioneer* and the *Press* of the next day, February 8.

In response to the invitation a delegate from the Western Union railroad company, formerly the Savannah line, announced that his company was ready to prorate with any line of boats, independent of all corporations, and engage to deliver freight on Lake Michigan. Captain John B. Davis and Captain J. R. Hatcher, of whom the former had been in St. Paul some days looking over the situation, represented the Archer and Hart company of Memphis and Louisville. Captain Davis proposed a joint stock company capitalized at $300,000, one-half of which should be raised by the merchants and farmers of the upper river, or, if desired, more than one-half of the stock might be taken by popular subscription. If this stock should be sold his company would handle the rest and would put into the upper river trade during the next season four side-wheel steamboats, two stern-wheelers, and ten barges, all at an appraised valuation of $256,000. Moreover, Captain Davis was armed with powers of attorney in case the convention might be ready to talk business. In writing, the chairman of the convention had a proposition from S. T. Webster of Chicago for the organization of a $500,000 corporation, in which no stockholder might own more than one share of a par value of one hundred dollars; if each of the delegates would take one share Mr. Webster offered to secure purchasers for the remainder, or, if necessary, take up the balance himself. He would put six boats into freight service on the river the next season.[31]

Meantime Commodore Davidson had been listening to the various offers as well as to the comments about his line and his methods. When asked if he would like to address the convention he rose and announced that he could make rates as low as anybody. Some one then asked if he would do it. Yes, said he, he had in the past done so and should continue in the same way. There had been "exaggerated statements relative to the profits of his line, while the gross earnings of the company were less than half a million, out of which all the expenses had to be paid. People talked as though there were no other boats on the river except his. There was the Northwestern Line and the Northern Line, and he certainly did not own all of them. All I ask is justice—a free and fair fight. State the rates you will pay,

[31] This offer is printed in the *St. Paul Press*, February 9, 1866.

and I will carry at that price if I can afford it. I will carry as cheap as any one." He then went on to offer to lease his whole fleet for a flat sum. "If merchants and shippers, or this convention, want to take our line, and run it the coming season, we will let them have it for $156,000, which amounts to the sum of $32.50 per day for each boat, with a guarantee on their part, to deliver the boats at the close of the season in as good order as they received them. I will charter the whole line for $156,000 to run exclusively between La Crosse and St. Paul, and not charge anything for the barges. [I am] prepared to make this arrangement or sell stock as cheap as anybody."[32]

Davidson remarked that it was surprising that he should see no merchants of Minnesota on the floor of the convention. He had done business with many of them and it was rather remarkable that none should be present in view of the nature of the proceedings.[33] Only one man, William P. Murray, came actively to the defense of the commodore; he spoke of the services rendered in times past by the steamboat men and blamed the troubles of the complaining shippers primarily on the railroads.[34]

[32] Two days later, February 9, the *Press* called into question the statement of Commodore Davidson with respect to the relations between the White Collar and the Northwestern lines. "It required considerable facial nerve to make this statement to an audience nine-tenths of whom knew there was not a word of truth in it. It is a fact perfectly well known to all business men that the two Packet companies were, during the year, virtually one consolidated company; that is to say, their gross earnings were paid into a common fund, and equally divided between the two at the end of the season. There was no competition whatever between them; not a particle; and when Capt. Davidson said there was he — well — he was joking."

Furthermore the *Press* questioned Davidson's statement about the earnings of the two companies; for wheat carriage alone it maintained that at least $900,000 gross receipts had been taken, while the total down freight must have amounted to $550,000, at the lowest figure, for Davidson alone, leaving the up freight charges to pay the expense of running the line. If the figures sent to Donnelly were correct, it must be concluded that popular estimates of the earnings of both Northwestern and White Collar lines were much too large.

[33] The *Press*, February 10, found this fact easily explained: the merchants were intimidated. It reported that not long before an agent of Davidson's line at Hastings had stated that if the merchants of that town were not satisfied with the rates "we will put the tariff on wheat three cents lower at Mendota, and then we'll see what will become of Hastings." St. Paul merchants, said the editor, told him that they would back the new line if there should be any chance of its succeeding, but while it was in doubt they did not dare run the risk of being victims of the monopoly's vengeful feelings.

[34] This was brought out much more fully in the *Pioneer* than in the *Press* report. Among the Murray manuscripts, in the possession of the Minnesota historical soci-

A long set of resolutions crowned the work of the convention. The theme of them all was, "Down with monopolies!" The only method of breaking their power was to withdraw patronage, no matter how low the rates might go, and divert traffic to other and competing means of transportation. As for the railroads, this might be done by making use of those which touched the Mississippi south of La Crosse and Prairie du Chien. A direct appeal was made to the Wisconsin legislature to take steps to right the wrongs perpetrated by railroads tapping Lake Michigan, and it was pointed out that a continuance of existing conditions could but create ill will not only toward the roads but toward the states which allowed them to function. A memorial was addressed to the state legislature requesting a rate-fixing law. Finally a plan was framed for the organization of a new steamboat line which was to have a capital of $500,000, in which no company was to own more than two-fifths of the shares, which were to be of a par value of twenty-five dollars. This was essentially the plan presented by Captain Davis to the convention.

In commenting upon the acts of the convention the *Pioneer* remarked the next day that while the body did some practical things, like sending a delegation to the Wisconsin legislature, it did many impractical ones, among which was debarring practical steamboat men from its proposed company. Furthermore, the convention did not raise money to start the competing line; "they were assembled to devise means for the reduction of freights, and a feasible plan was presented — but it cost money." A fifty-thousand dollar subscription to the stock would then and there have laid the foundation of a competing line, "but if a convention of intelligent men, who have devoted special atten-

ety, is a note reading, "Conductors of the La Crosse & Minnesota RR please Pass Hon Wm Murray on account of the La Crosse & Min & St Paul Packet Co Oblige yours

Wm F. Davidson
Prs"

Incidentally it may be remarked that this is one of the few scraps of paper in the handwriting of Davidson which the writer has so far been able to discover. Colonel J. H. Davidson, for nearly twenty years counsel for all Davidson's steamboat interests up and down the river from St. Paul to New Orleans, has told the writer that he would be unable to lay his hand upon a single one of the innumerable letters and documents of various nature which passed through his hands during that time. They have simply disappeared.

tion to the question, were unwilling to stand by their guns, what can be expected from the people at large?''

In light of the happenings of the following weeks and months the *Pioneer* hit the nail on the head. When it came right down to a matter of backing their convictions with cold cash the enthusiasts either could not or would not do it. To be sure, within three weeks the Minnesota transportation company was formed, committees were appointed in each of the towns most vitally interested, and the incorporators entered into correspondence with steamboat companies down the river, especially with Hart, Archer, and company of Memphis.[35] Moreover, the St. Paul board of trade agreed to take $50,000 of the stock provided the other $450,000 would be raised. Except for a random notice, however, the Minnesota transportation company did not figure largely in the news of the day, and when, upon the opening of the river to navigation, there was the customary account of the boats to be operated during the season, there was no mention of the new organization; thereafter it quietly dropped out of sight.[36]

Two items of interest alone remain to be mentioned in leaving the anti-monopoly issue of 1865 and 1866. In the struggle over state printing the republican faction represented by the *Press* lost to its opponents, and the *Pioneer* had the satisfaction of announcing the passage of an act providing for throwing open to public bids that which had hitherto been a bit of patronage at the disposal of the legislature. Before the year 1866 had come to an end Davidson had sold his interest in the *Pioneer* and once more this paper became the most prominent organ of the democratic party in the state of Minnesota, and one of the leaders in the northwest.

To those who had been following the course of events, however, these two factors were wholly eclipsed by an episode more

[35] *St. Paul Press*, February 25, 1866. In the issue of March 23, the *Press* announced the official personnel of the new company. The men were all from those who had been prominent in the anti-monopoly convention.

[36] *Ibid.*, April 20, 1866. A laudatory quarter-column was given to the Northern line (see below), a shorter but appreciative note to the Northwestern line, and, under the heading ''La Crosse & Minnesota Packet Co.,'' these words: ''This company places two new steamers upon their line this season between St. Paul and La Crosse, which are now composed of The City of St. Paul, Phil. Sheridan, Northern Belle, Keokuk.''

directly connected with upper river steamboating. The *Pioneer* of May 3, 1866, contained a special dispatch from Dubuque announcing the formation of a new steamboat company to do general passenger and freight business between that city and St. Paul. This organization, under the name of the Northwestern Union packet company, had purchased all the property of the La Crosse and St. Paul steam packet company (the White Collar line) and of the Dubuque, Prairie du Chien, and St. Paul railroad packet company (the Northwestern line). "The new company," remarked the *Pioneer*, which, it will be recalled, was still Davidson's paper, "will be a mammouth transportation company in every respect. It will run and operate over fifty steamboats and nearly one hundred barges, while its capital is ample for all emergencies. Its officers are known to be men of the highest ability in their business, and have all of them had life-long experience in steamboating."[37] The president of the new concern was Commodore Davidson; John Lawler, previously president of the Northwestern line, together with George A. Blanchard, William E. Wellington, William Rhodes, and Peyton S. (Pate) Davidson, comprised the remainder of the list of officials. Furthermore, in the hands of these men was consolidated the control of the stock of the organization. Wellington and Peyton S. Davidson were joint superintendents. The latter, a brother of the commodore, had been associated with him in the White Collar line and had been, as he continued to be, in charge of the boat-building yards at La Crosse, where practically all repairs were made for the fleet and where many of the new boats were built.[38]

It appears that an unsuccessful attempt had been made to in-

[37] The *St. Paul Press*, May 5, 1866, gives a list of ten side-wheelers and twenty stern-wheelers as comprising the fleet of the Northwestern Union line, and states that it also owned seventy-three barges.

[38] McMaster, *Sixty years on the upper Mississippi*, 187, affirms that during the period before the consolidation of the White Collar and Northwestern lines, but while the two had a working agreement, most of the earnings which were supposed to be pooled were absorbed in repairs at the Davidson yards, in insurance and drawbacks. "Scribe Harris one of the victims told me he never received a cent of dividends except in watered stock, which amounted to $70,000. A few years after, when he met Davidson, he told him he was a d——d rascal and a thief saying to him 'I will sell you my stock for anything you will give.' Davidson said he would give him 12½ cents a share and Harris took it. A few years later Davidson bought the line."

duce the newly formed Savannah packet company to come into the larger combination.[39] This company, which had figured before the anti-monopoly convention, had plans to break the hold of the larger companies by taking freight from the river and transporting it by rail to Racine, where it could connect by steamer with Chicago and Buffalo; it further planned to build a branch road into Milwaukee to obtain a firmer hold upon the grain carrying of the upper Mississippi. Despite this ambitious scheme, however, the traffic of the upper river and its branches was too securely controlled by the great organizations to be easily diverted. While on the main stream the Northern line of St. Louis, of which more will be said later, was always a factor to be considered — especially in the through passenger service between St. Louis and St. Paul — there was little opportunity for more than spasmodic and uncertain competition to develop anywhere north of Winona. So far as Minnesota and eastern Wisconsin were concerned this meant a practical monopoly for the Northwestern Union line.

Below Winona, however, the situation was somewhat modified. In addition to the two large concerns there were several more or less ambitious attempts to break into the monopoly and share the undoubtedly large returns. One of the interlopers was the Savannah line. Another was Robson and Hatcher's Winona line[40] which, in 1867, became the Red line and peculiarly identified with John Robson, of Winona, its manager. The business of this line was largely confined to the carrying of freight from

[39] *St. Paul Press*, May 11, 1866, quoting from the *Stillwater Messenger*: "The Savannah Packet Company — young in years, but strong in the confidence of the people — refused to be slimed over and then swallowed bodily by the huge combination of a few weeks ago, by which two of the great monopolies of the Upper Mississippi were merged into the 'Northwestern Union Packet Company.' The Savannah company said to the wily seducers, 'get thee behind me, Satan.' The Savannah Line will run three boats each week to this city Stillwater, forming a tri-weekly line between this place and Savannah. This line is now composed of the Lady Pike, George W. Weeks, and Viola."

[40] *St. Paul Press*, May 15, 1866. Captain J. R. Hatcher, who had appeared before the anti-monopoly convention as a "trust-buster," apparently gave up the notion of trying for any portion of the trade above Winona, but with Robson found the field below that point sufficiently inviting. See *Winona Weekly Republican*, January 2, 1867. The following season, however, the Red line no longer numbered Hatcher as one of its supporters. *Ibid.*, December 11, 1867. He shortly became a member of the firm of Langley and Hatcher, which acted as the Winona agent of the Northwestern Union line. *Ibid.*, April 14, 1869.

lower Lake Pepin to points south. Another freighting concern was Captain Joseph Reynolds' Diamond Jo line, while some business was done by the Chicago, Fulton, and River steamers, and by the small People's line.

The season of 1866 marks a distinct point in the fortunes of river navigation, particularly for the hundred miles north of Winona. Not only was it a season of very low water, which necessitated taking the larger boats off the run to St. Paul and transferring freight and passengers to the smaller craft which could be maneuvered in shallower water, but by this time there was rail connection from Winona to St. Paul by the way of Owatonna. Many passengers, induced by the saving of time as well as by the novelty of the newer mode of transportation, preferred to take the somewhat circuitous rail route.

The following season seemed to reverse the prophecy of 1866. Water was high; freight was abundant. All the steamboat lines were busy, especially in the spring and fall. Commodore Davidson's Northwestern Union did a very heavy business. Furthermore, his field of operations, which seems to have included the run to St. Louis only intermittently hitherto, now definitely included the portion of the river below Dubuque.[41] During the season of 1868 this incursion into the middle river was further advanced by the purchase of the St. Louis and Quincy packet line and its steamers as well as a large wharf at St. Louis.[42]

The period between the organization of the Northwestern Union packet company and about the year 1872 may be called the heyday of Commodore Davidson's steamboating career. New steamers were built each season; more barges were added to handle the freight — especially grain, which was now being carried in bulk almost exclusively. No expense was spared to make the packets attractive to passengers; affable officers, good music — in volume, at any rate, for it was supplied by brass bands — a teeming menu, all were calculated not only to lure the traveler from railroads, where competition had come into play, but to prevent patronage of the Northwestern Union's great rival, the Northern line.[43] By 1868 there was daily service be-

[41] *Winona Weekly Republican*, December 11, 1867.

[42] *Ibid.*, December 16, 1868.

[43] One of the *St. Paul Pioneer's* "young men" reported the breakfast bill of fare which he found on one of the Northwestern Union's packets; with its nineteen

tween Dubuque and St. Paul and Stillwater; three times a week boats left both St. Louis and St. Paul for the main line trip; a triweekly service also connected St. Paul and Taylor's Falls on the St. Croix when water permitted. Connections were made for points on the Ohio, the Chippewa, and the lower Mississippi, as well as Missouri river points.[44] Shortly after the organization of the Northwestern Union, in 1866, there had been established the "lightning line," made up of fast steamers running between St. Paul and La Crosse, so that a passenger could make the trip between St. Paul and Chicago in thirty-four hours. Davidson's fastest steamers were put on this run and no freight was carried nor were barges towed. Even when rail connection between Winona and St. Paul was established, in 1868, necessitating the use of a steamboat only between La Crosse and Winona to cover the distance between Chicago and Minneapolis or St. Paul, the "lightning line" was for a time able to hold its own. Nevertheless, good water conditions were an absolute necessity for the successful operation of these fast passenger packets, consequently the summer stage of the river always gave the advantage to the railroad train, while the long winter months did much to dislodge the steamboat habit from the minds of travelers.

Commodore Davidson's advent into the carrying trade below Dubuque was not viewed with unqualified equanimity by the Northern line. So long as Davidson had confined himself to the stretch above La Crosse, the St. Louis men were content to share in the through traffic to St. Paul and abide amicably with the local potentate. It was a quite different thing when it was necessary to divide the pickings down stream. Hostilities promptly ensued; the season of 1868 saw a bitter rate war between the two lines during which passengers were carried between St. Louis and St. Paul for a dollar each.[45] Such a state of affairs

or twenty varieties of meat dishes and a half dozen kinds of bread, it can be imagined what waste there must have been, and how only a very low range of prices for foodstuffs could have made it at all possible. *St. Paul Pioneer*, June 18, 1870.

"Boston," in his third installment of "Notes of a trip down the river," *Winona Weekly Republican*, August 11, 1869, gives an account of what was done to entertain passengers on the *Phil Sheridan*, "one of the whitest boats of the White Collar Line." The antics of the second clerk and his "big bug" savor of Mark Twain's Mississippi yarns.

[44] *St. Paul Pioneer*, May 1, 1868.

[45] *Winona Weekly Republican*, May 12, 1869.

could not last long, hence before the season of 1869 opened the officials of the two companies had come to an understanding and had established a traffic schedule covering all points between St. Louis and the head of navigation on the Mississippi.[46]

In 1870 Commodore Davidson left St. Paul and established himself in St. Louis, where he resided for the next ten years and where he maintained the principal offices for his steamboating interests. He was welcomed as an addition to the business community and his activities in connection with river navigation were favorably commented upon. Future possibilities were glowingly pictured:

This St. Louis and St. Paul trade is one of the heaviest for the packets within the limits of the United States, or any other country. The round trip is 1600 miles, and the steamers connect with some twenty railroads twice during each round trip. They are constantly putting off or taking on freight and passengers, and are requested frequently to tow barges from point to point. If the Lower Mississippi country were as well built up and populated as the Upper, what an immense traffic there would be along the 1200 miles below St. Louis over and above the large amount already transacted by the fifteen large loaded steamers and one or two fleets of barges which we send out per week to New Orleans and way points on the Mississippi.[47]

By the time of Davidson's removal to St. Louis he had become for the Northwestern line what he had previously been for his older White Collar company, the principal moving spirit, since some of those who hitherto had been the directing factors in the old Northwestern line had withdrawn their interest—notably William E. Wellington, who seems to have been one of the few intimately associated with the commodore who did not suffer financially upon severing relations.

From the advent of Davidson in the St. Louis business there was repeated, with little change of detail, the story of 1865 and

[46] *Winona Weekly Republican.* See also *St. Paul Pioneer,* April 12, 1870, for schedule. These rates, which remained in force with little change until the Northwestern Union and the Northern lines consolidated in 1873, contained among others the following items: St. Paul to St. Louis, grain, per hundred-weight, 25 cents; flour, per barrel, 50 cents; miscellaneous freight, per hundred-weight, 35 cents. Passenger rates from St. Paul to Winona were $6.50, first class, $4, second-class; to La Crosse, $7 and $4.50; to Prairie du Chien, $9 and $5.50; to Dubuque and Dunleith, $11 and $6.50; to Burlington, $15 and $7.50; to Keokuk, $16 and $8; to St. Louis, $20 and $8.

[47] An exchange in the *St. Paul Pioneer,* November 2, 1870.

1866, all ending in the merger of the Northern and Northwestern Union lines with the commodore in the saddle. In 1857 a number of competing rivermen had decided to arrange a schedule so that a regular line might be established between St. Louis and St. Paul; the following year the informal arrangement was continued and by the end of 1858 the Northern line was a going concern.[48] By 1860 it had a working agreement with the Minnesota line so that the upper river traffic was apportioned between them.[49] It was not long after this that Davidson appeared upon the scene with results already noted in this paper. After the vicious river war of 1868, there was uneasy peace for a season, during which the Northern line attempted to strengthen its position by absorbing its principal rival on the river between St. Louis and Keokuk, as well as by building several new boats.[50] Davidson likewise prepared for the future by adding to his fleet.

It was during the winter of 1869-1870 that Commodore Davidson extended still further his front line of operations, for, while he laid up most of his boats at either La Crosse or St. Louis, two of his largest, the *Tom Jasper* and the *Phil Sheridan*, were put on a run between St. Louis and Vicksburg, thus attempting to break into the lower river game. From this beginning it was a simple matter to reach farther and farther down the river until contact was made with New Orleans.[51] An interest in some cotton plantations was acquired during the progress downstream.

While in 1870 there were many factors pointing to a still greater control of the boating on the Mississippi, this same year beheld an incident which long figured in the finances of the Northwestern Union line. On May 15, 1870, several barrels of

[48] Blakeley, "Advent of commerce in Minnesota," *Minnesota historical collections*, 8: 404, 406, 407.

[49] Merrick, "Steamboating and steamboat men of the upper Mississippi," Burlington, Iowa, *Saturday Evening Post*, October 30, 1915.

[50] *Winona Weekly Republican*, December 22, 1869.

[51] *St. Paul Pioneer*, November 11, 1870, notes the completion of a new steamer at Cincinnati, the *John Kyle*, which was to be placed in the New Orleans trade. The *Winona Herald*, December 30, 1870, quoting from the *Cincinnati Commercial* of December 12, announces the completion of a new Davidson steamer, which was named the *S. S. Merrill* in honor of the general manager of the Milwaukee and St. Paul railroad; "The Merrill will ply in the New Orleans trade until the upper Mississippi is open to St. Paul."

some petroleum product caught fire on the steamer *War Eagle* while moored at the levee at La Crosse.[52] Much property was destroyed in the subsequent conflagration, and several lives were lost. Suits for damages arising out of the disaster dragged on for years and in the end cost the company some two or three hundred thousand dollars.

The years 1870 and 1871 were marked outwardly by no especial development; the traffic agreement between the two rival lines continued to operate, as it did during a considerable portion of 1872. Toward the end of the season, however, the joint agreement was suddenly cast aside and a new river war started. Passenger rates from St. Louis to St. Paul dropped from $20 to $4, while all the devices of cutthroat competition were resorted to in order to drive the opponent to the wall.[53] Nevertheless, this was but the final flare-up before the dying out of the conflict, since before navigation opened in 1873 the two competitors had been merged into one organization, the Keokuk and Northern line packet company. A third line, the St. Louis and Keokuk, which had for some two years practically been run in conjunction with the Northern, was incorporated at the same time.[54] Incorporated under the laws of Missouri, the new com-

[52] *Winona Herald*, May 20, 1870.

[53] The season of 1870 was one of particularly low water. All the big boats had to be taken from the run above Winona. With respect to the passage of the rapids at Keokuk, the *Winona Herald*, July 22, 1870, says: "Passengers by the Davidson Line are carried around the Rapids twelve miles by rail, while those of the Northern Line are taken down the Rapids by the small steamer Charles Cheever. Freight is towed down the Rapids in barges by the G. H. Wilson and Dan Hine. All the arrangements for transshipment have been perfected, and no delay and but little inconvenience is experienced by passengers, the connections both above and below the falls being closely made."

[54] *St. Paul Pioneer*, March 7, 1873. The *Winona Weekly Republican*, March 12, 1873, quoting from a St. Louis paper, stated that six of the largest steamers, all of Davidson's line, would not be evaluated with the rest of the property "as they will run in other trades." The boats were, in part, some that Davidson had been previously using on the lower river, hence it is apparent that they were to be kept there.

S. W. McMaster, who comments so spicily on the connection of Davidson with the Northwestern line, also pays his compliments to that gentleman on the subject of the consolidation of 1873 (*Sixty years on the upper Mississippi*, 188-170): "The wily Davidson was after the lucrative traffic and another object he had was to get control of this line [the Northern] and wreck it for his own benefit. So as I said he commenced cutting passenger rates until the rate for passenger transportation to St. Paul from St. Louis was cut down to one dollar and boats of both lines were crowded with all sorts of passengers, carrying with them their own provisions. This was kept up for some months. In the fall both companies were exhausted. Unfortunately

pany had a paid-up capital of $700,000, with the privilege of increasing it to double that amount. The total equipment of the company was little greater than had been that of the Northwestern Union in 1866: twenty freight and passenger boats, a dozen tow boats, and a hundred barges, a total of about 30,000 tons. Even so, the Keokuk and Northern was the most powerful organization on the river at the time. Davidson became superintendent, and with two Northern line men, John S. McCune and Thomas B. Rhodes, formed the executive committee which was charged with the management of the business, including the appointment of officers for the boats and selection of agents at the different ports.

Into this latest combination there entered factors which had either not operated at all in 1866 or which had but just begun to appear. The Northwestern Union packet company marked an offensive; the Keokuk and Northern was defensive. Not only did the various steamboat lines find that unlimited competition was ruining them, but that they were faced by a common foe, the railroad. It was the railroad which had driven Davidson from the Minnesota river not long after he had definitely gone

for our company they agreed to let Davidson in the next season. Capt. Tom Buford called on the stockholders in the winter for their signatures and the fatal deed was done. Stockholders received no dividends after this as by the time the two companies were out of debt, Davidson had control, having secured control of a majority of the stockholders. It was done in this way, the Keokuk or McUne line, as it was called, running between St. Louis and Keokuk had been merged with the Northern Line some two years before Davidson had been taken in. McUne dying, who had owned most of the stock in this line, it was found that the line was heavily in debt and that the stock must be sold to pay the indebtedness. Our people ought to have bought it at once, but did not, and Davidson stepped in and bought it which gave him control of the Northern Line by some few shares of stock. The directors of the Northern Line had been elected for another year a short time before the sale. so Davidson did not get control until the next year, in about 1870.*

"The first thing Davidson done the next season was to call on the stockholders of the line for a 20 percent assessment to pay off the indebtedness made by repairs, etc. Some of them were foolish enough to respond. Our old citizen, Bill Henderson, paid his 20 percent on $30,000 worth of stock, for which he never received a cent. Some $55,000 worth of this stock was owned and is still held in Rock Island. This robber of every steamboat interest on the upper Mississippi, has gone to his reward. When he consummated his last and greatest deal in St. Louis he was holding outdoor revival meetings on the levee of St. Louis, and he took his final departure from this world in all the order [*sic*] of sanctity."

* In his dates, as probably in some other details, Mr. McMaster became a little confused.

into the Mississippi trade. The railroad, between 1866 and 1872, was slowly driving him south from St. Paul. Beginning in 1847 as the Milwaukee and Waukesha railroad there was developed by construction, purchase, and lease the Milwaukee and St. Paul, which connected Lake Michigan with the Mississippi at Prairie du Chien. Then it crossed the river to link up with other roads and by a roundabout route reached St. Paul and Minneapolis in 1866. Similarly the La Crosse and Milwaukee, chartered in 1852, by various consolidations and extensions reached La Crosse in 1858. Up to this point railroad extension had been serving as a medium to bring grist to the mill of the steamboats; every time a railhead reached the river so much greater was the outlet through which could be poured the agricultural products of the northwest. By 1869, however, the St. Paul and Chicago railroad—a long dormant enterprise—had crept south from the head of navigation as far as Hastings, and then, sharing in the prevalent railroad-building boom, strode on till it reached Winona in 1871 and La Crescent in 1872. Merged with the Milwaukee and St. Paul, an outgrowth of the La Crosse and Prairie du Chien roads, it filled the gap between Milwaukee and Chicago in 1874, and, as the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul of today, offered the shipper or traveler a road to the east open throughout the year and not affected by low water or shut up by ice. The bridging of the gap between La Crescent and McGregor in 1876, thus linking Prairie du Chien with the upper towns along the river, was a detail which merely emphasized the trend of events.

After 1873 it made little difference whether or not the river between Fulton and St. Louis was edged with steel rails; so long as for half the distance between St. Louis and St. Paul the steamboat had to meet rail competition, its activity was being rapidly cut to the handling of way traffic and that of diminishing volume. The Keokuk and Northern line packet company, then, entered life under an unlucky star; it fought a losing fight to the end. A premature requiem may be said to have sounded in the paragraph appearing in the spring of 1874 in a newspaper which for years had made its steamboat and river news one of its principal features:

The arrival of the first boat has ceased to be the important event it used to be in days gone by, but for the sake of history

we give the arrivals of the first boats as they have occurred at Winona in 1856.[55]

In the words of a man long associated with Commodore Davidson[56] this is what happened:

The railroad would take a little town where we got a quantity of freight, if the railroad struck it as it did between here [St. Paul] and Winona, and put the freight so low that the shippers could not afford to give it to the steamboats. They would make it so cheap as to kill off river business, for the boats felt that they could not afford to land and pick it up.

On the lower river it was the same story:

Memphis was a great cotton center. We [the Davidsons] had a cotton plantation about thirty miles from Memphis. The railroad put a price for carrying cotton so low that we could not afford to put it on the boat, but when they got fifteen miles out from this landing they raised the price so much that planters could not afford to ship it by rail, but hired teams to haul it to different points where rates were low and then put it on the railroads. It would pay to haul ten miles and get the low rates. The result was that the boats could not do anything.

Cutting rates was but one of numerous methods employed by railroads to put steamboats off the river, but they all tended to the same end.[57]

Not alone by paralleling the Mississippi was carried on the process of throttling steamboating with iron rails. In December, 1873, the Green Bay and Minnesota railroad was formally opened.[58] This road, stretching across Wisconsin for two hun-

[55] *Winona Weekly Republican*, April 15, 1874.

[56] Colonel J. H. Davidson, general counsel for Davidson's steamboating interests from 1870 to the time of the commodore's death.

[57] There were many methods by which life could be made miserable for steamboat men; the matter of bridges, for instance, was provocative of much trouble. When the Chicago and Northwestern built a bridge across the Mississippi at Clinton, Iowa, the span was made 119 feet, instead of 160 feet as the rivermen contended it should be. The railroad hired three of the Northwestern Union's steamers to demonstrate that 119 feet was ample. Two of the steamers went through the span without mishap, but a gust of wind caught the third and it lost a wheel. "Incidentally it may be said that the jury agreed that the short span was no menace to navigation. It is said that one of the pilots that took part in this exhibition was taken to Chicago by the railway company and pensioned, he and his wife, staying at a fine hotel, with all bills paid, as long as he lived, which is only one of the links in the chain with which the railroads have manacled the Mississippi." Merrick, "Steamboating and steamboatmen of the upper Mississippi," Burlington, Iowa, *Saturday Evening Post*, May 27, 1916.

[58] *Winona Weekly Republican*, December 24, 1837.

dred and fifteen miles, brought Winona in direct contact with Lake Michigan by the shortest rail route. This town, which in 1871 had been almost wholly dependent upon the river, was now practically freed from it; rail connection with Milwaukee and Chicago, with Green Bay, and with Lake Superior via St. Paul, went far toward making its denizens look upon the Mississippi as an obstacle rather than a support.

Still another railroad factor entering at the same time was the newly completed road between St. Paul and Duluth. Not only did it draw from St. Paul and its tributary area, but grain from down stream could be profitably sent by barge from points along the St. Croix and Lake Pepin to Stillwater, thence by rail to St. Paul and Duluth.[59]

It is not without interest to note that it was just at the time Davidson was having his last fight with the Northern line, preparatory to absorbing it, that the granger movement, of which the anti-monopoly affair of 1865-1866 was a premonitory rumble, swept over the northwest. This outburst was directed in large degree against transportation abuses just as the protest of 1866 had been. In 1866, however, the steamboat men had come in for condemnation equal to that directed against the railroads, wherever the steamboat functioned as a transportation unit. In the protests of 1872-1874 the railroad occupied the center of the stage and river transportation was all but ignored. No more pointed indication of the approaching demise of steamboating could be desired.

Although agrarian uneasiness failed to seize upon river transportation as a victim, the prevailing labor unrest of the seventies did not pass it by. In August, 1873, the Keokuk and Northern was partially tied up on account of a strike among its pilots. The dissatisfaction which thus culminated in a walk-out had been brewing all summer — in fact ever since the reorganization, when wages had been scaled down. As a step in the direction of economy the new management divided the run from St. Louis to St. Paul at Keokuk and gave the pilots on the lower

[59] *Winona Weekly Republican*, November 19, 1873. During the season of 1873 the *Charlie Cheever* towed 131 barges into Stillwater with an estimated cargo of a million and a half bushels of wheat. Two other steamers were engaged in the same towing run. In 1872 the Northern line acquired the contract for this business with the St. Paul and Lake Superior railroad. *Ibid.*, March 8, 1872.

end twenty-five dollars per month less than those on the upper run received. "For almost thirty years the company have sent out their boats regularly, and never before in the annals of the history of the line is there a similar record to be found. That such a trouble should occur at this late period of the company's existence is a matter greatly to be deplored."[60]

Railroad competition, labor troubles, law suits, and a constantly increasing cost of maintenance would have accounted amply for the desperate struggle in which Davidson's line was engaged after 1873. But there were other difficulties, the most annoying of which, perhaps, was continuing internal dissension. A group of stockholders had been dissatisfied with the reorganization of 1873, insofar as it had affected the Northern line, and had immediately taken steps to shake the hold Davidson had secured. The fight for a receivership lasted until 1881, at which time the Keokuk and Northern was declared bankrupt.[61] The depression following the panic of 1873 had made matters still more difficult, so that it is a question whether the action of the disgruntled stockholders did more than give the final push.

Determined not to be driven from the steamboat game, Commodore Davidson bought in for nominal prices the best of the boats and other equipment disposed of at a sheriff's sale, and immediately organized another company.[62] This concern, the St. Louis and St. Paul passenger and freight line, received a charter under the laws of Wisconsin and established its main offices at La Crosse. Its capitalization of $100,000 and its ten boats made it appear a puny affair when compared with either the Keokuk and Northern or the Northwestern Union lines. W. F. Davidson and P. S. Davidson both were among the officials, the former as general manager and the latter as president, but no other names prominent in the earlier organizations appear in the list of promoters.[63] For six years, until the death of

[60] *St. Paul Pioneer*, August 26, 1873, quoting from the *St. Louis Despatch* of August 20. The pilots on the upper run were to receive $150 per month, those on the lower, $125, or five dollars less than was received by a first class clerk.

[61] Blakeley, "Advent of commerce in Minnesota," *Minnesota historical collections*, 8: 414. See also G. B. Merrick, "Joseph Reynolds and the Diamond Jo line steamers," Mississippi valley historical association, *Proceedings*, 8: 237.

[62] *St. Paul and Minneapolis Pioneer Press*, April 9, 1881.

[63] Merrick states that Peyton S. Davidson, S. F. Clinton, and Lafayette Holmes organized a second line at La Crosse which was in existence for one year. "Joseph

Commodore Davidson in 1887, the line struggled on, always on the down grade. In addition to the railroad competition existing at the time of its formation, it had to face a new rival after 1886, when the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy, a protégé of the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy railroad, began running trains on its track along the east bank of the Mississippi south from St. Paul.

When Davidson died the question arose with his heirs as to whether it would be better to sell the line for what could be obtained or attempt to keep it in operation. The latter counsel prevailed and for a season or two the unequal fight was maintained.[64] Then the line was sold to Charles H. Petsch of the Hamm brewing company, and others, who kept it running until 1890, when it was withdrawn from the river.[65]

Perhaps a word should be added regarding the concern which had developed into Davidson's greatest rival on the river during his last days. Back in the early sixties Joseph Reynolds, "Diamond Jo," bought and sold wheat which he shipped east from Prairie du Chien. Convinced that he was not securing fair treatment from the rivermen he built a little stern-wheeler, the *Lansing*, to carry his own freight. The threat seemed to work, for a short time later Davidson and Reynolds entered into an agreement whereby the latter sold to Davidson his vessel, and the commodore, in turn, bound himself to deal squarely with Reynolds. A similar experience the following year, however, caused Reynolds to build and operate the *Diamond Jo*, only to make a new bargain and sell out as before. Three or four years of uneasy coöperation led Reynolds to buy a couple of steamers

Reynolds and the Diamond Jo line steamers," Mississippi valley historical association, *Proceedings*, 8: 237. The contemeporary newspapers not only give no indication of this, but enumerate these three men among those associated with W. F. Davidson in forming the St. Louis and St. Paul passenger and freight line.

[64] This is the account of Colonel J. H. Davidson of St. Paul. Colonel Davidson states that he was invited to be present at the conference when the fate of the line was to be decided; when his advice was asked he told the owners that if it were his property he would have all the packets and barges towed into Pig Eye slough and burned. He maintained that what it would cost to get the equipment in shape for the season of 1888 would more than eat up any profits which might accrue. The experience of that season and the following more than justified Colonel Davidson's prophecy.

[65] Merrick, "Joseph Reynolds and the Diamond Jo line steamers," Mississippi valley historical association, *Proceedings*, 8: 249.

and two barges, and from this small beginning grew the Diamond Jo line which was destined to outlive the larger organization for many years.[66] At first only freighting and towing were attempted by Reynolds; in 1874 he purchased the slender remaining equipment of John Robson's Red line to be used in transporting lumber and coal between Rock Island and St. Paul.[67] After Davidson's St. Louis and St. Paul line began to get into deeper and deeper water Reynolds turned his attention more and more to the passenger end of the business, which he had regarded hitherto as a mere side issue.

Of all the prominent steamboat men of the upper Mississippi in the period after the civil war, William F. Davidson stands out in a peculiar way. On a relatively small scale he typifies the economic forces which were then beginning to make themselves apparent in all lines of endeavor: combination and absorption if this could be accomplished, otherwise ruthless competition to drive the opponent to the wall. It is, perhaps, not unfair to liken Davidson in his steamboating operations to Jay Gould and his manipulation of railroads and their finances; many common characteristics were evidenced by the two men. And yet Davidson was but a product of his day. Execrated as he was and still is by many who remember him — sometimes to their own sorrow — he was following the general line of activity pursued by business promoters of his time. There is no evidence that his business dealings appealed to the commodore in any other light than legitimate activities. That anyone could call him personally immoral was quite obviously far from his mind. Sometime during the seventies he "got religion," and one of the tangible evidences of his conversion was his putting the bars off his boats. Voluntarily he cut off a source of revenue which was almost universally looked upon as not only unquestionably good business but also quite proper.

Leaving out of consideration the question of rail competition there can be no doubt that the steamboat lines were far from economical in their management. Costly law suits, some of them hanging over from early days, hampered operations. In-

[66] Merrick's article, cited in note 65, contains a full and circumstantial account of Reynolds as a steamboat man.

[67] *Winona Weekly Republican*, March 11, 1874.

ternal dissensions prevented the coöperation which might have gone far to stave off defeat. Yet, viewed from without, and after the whole game has been played, may there not be some ground for the suspicion that the greatest obstacle to a continuing prosperity, at least on a small scale, of steamboating on the upper river was the result of a tactical or strategic blunder? The steamboat men made a fatal mistake when they became so closely involved with railroads in the earliest days: they sheltered the viper which stung them. Just to what extent Davidson was financially tied up with railroad magnates is difficult to determine, nay, even to surmise, but there was a deal of interlocking of interests which in the end redounded to the benefit of the latter.[68]

Reversing the case, there seems to be good reason to believe that the railroads were no less shortsighted than their opponents. In their zeal to drive out all river competition railway dictators failed to see that steamboats could be continued as valuable adjuncts to land carriage, economical to a degree. Each, in its mad desire to destroy the adversary, in its determination to exact from the public the ultimate pound of flesh, overlooked the possibility of both serving a fairly contented clientele to the advantage of all concerned.

Lester B. Shippee

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

[68] The writer has been unable to secure any definite information as to the source of Davidson's financial backing. Evidence seems to point to S. S. Merrill, general manager of the Milwaukee and St. Paul railroad, as one who stood in very close relations to the commodore.

DIPLOMACY OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO REGARDING THE ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC, 1848-1860[1]

The decade preceding the civil war was marked by great efforts on the part of the United States for interoceanic communication. Not only was it proposed to reach the Pacific by some three or four lines across its own domain, but at least three routes through northern Mexico were considered, while the dream of transisthmian connection was never more vivid. For much of this time it was thought that a railroad across the mountains to the west of the Mississippi would be very difficult to construct, or, if constructed, would be even more difficult to operate. Accordingly, the isthmian routes — Panama, Nicaragua, and Tehuantepec — were considered all the more important. But here there had to be faced not only the problem of construction in a hostile climate, but a diplomatic barrier which proved almost insuperable.

In Central America, Great Britain had to be dealt with, as well as the republics of Nicaragua and New Granada; and the story of the resulting complications has been told with relative completeness.[2] With reference to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and the hopes and prospects and diplomatic problems there, little has been written. Ostensibly, the question was more particularly one between the United States and Mexico, but it was perhaps in a measure modified by the possibility of European interference.[3] How imminent this possibility was, or how much underhand dickering there may have been, has not been ascertained.

[1] For assistance in the preparation of this paper the writer wishes to make grateful acknowledgment to Mr. Herbert E. Bolton and Mr. Herbert I. Priestley.

[2] Mary Wilhelmine Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian diplomacy, 1815-1915* (Washington, 1916); or any standard history of the United States.

[3] For suspicion of foreign interference in regard to Mexico consult *Senate executive documents,* 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 110, 114; *New York Herald,* September 7, 1852, quoted in *El Universal,* October 12, 1852; another quotation from the same paper in *El Universal,* January 8, 1852; *Congressional globe,* 32 congress, 2 session, 158, appendix 91 ff.

In order to ferret out the truth in regard to the matter, recourse to British, French, and Spanish archives would be necessary. This discussion is therefore confined to the diplomacy of the United States and Mexico, mentioning the foreign factor only incidentally.

The interest of the United States in the Tehuantepec route was awakened during the Mexican war when prospects of Pacific possessions loomed large. Vice-President Dallas seems to have considered the matter of sufficient importance to merit a publication setting forth its peculiar value.[4] Polk's entire cabinet realized its worth, Robert J. Walker deeming it of more importance than Upper California and New Mexico and desiring to make its sale a *sine qua non* of peace, and all the cabinet members being willing to pay $5,000,000 in order to obtain it.[5] Webster was apparently determined to go to war rather than give up American claims there, and Cass declared in 1857 that the "proximity of the Isthmus" to the shores of the United States, "the salubrity of the climate, the adaptedness of the ground for the construction of a railroad, and the great diminution of distance in comparison with other more southern routes," all conspired to point it out as "far preferable to any other route outside" the domain of his government.[6]

The south became interested in the Tehuantepec route as early as 1849, the year of the Memphis commercial convention. In the course of the next two years citizens of New Orleans acquired, or thought they acquired, a cession for the construction of the communication; and thereafter the question seems to have become purely sectional. Webster, in explaining why he sent to the Mexican chargé a note which virtually amounted to a threat of war, said that he deemed the step called for by the critical state of the Tehuantepec situation and the "excited and anxious feelings" existing in the minds of the people "especially at the south and west" in regard to the matter.[7] The route was again given considerable attention at the convention

[4] *De Bow's review*, old series, 7: 11.

[5] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849, now first printed from the original manuscript in the collections of the Chicago historical society*, edited by Milo M. Quaife (Chicago, 1910), 2: 471 ff.

[6] *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 40.

[7] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 127.

of New Orleans in 1852; and it received a favorable hearing before at least three other southern conventions of the ante bellum period.[8] It will be seen therefore that the Isthmus of Tehuantepec was, during the period under consideration, a respectable rival of Nicaragua and Panama, and, as such, deserves a place in the history of our isthmian enterprises.

Tehuantepec first entered the field of United States and Mexican diplomacy during the negotiations which terminated the Mexican war of 1846-1848. On April 15, 1847, Nicolas P. Trist, who had charge of those negotiations, was authorized to pay thirty instead of fifteen million dollars for Upper and Lower California and New Mexico, provided he could obtain also the right of passage and transit over the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. The project for a treaty enclosed with these instructions provided for the grant and guarantee of such a right.[9] But the Mexican commissioners refused the proposal outright, giving the following explanation with reference to the stand taken by their government:

> In the eighth article of your excellency's draft, the grant of a free passage across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec to the South Sea is sought in favor of North American citizens. We have orally explained to your excellency that some years since, the government of the republic granted to a private contractor a privilege, with reference to this object, which was soon transferred, with the sanction of the same government, to English subjects, of whose rights Mexico cannot dispose.[10]

The concession referred to by the Mexican commissioners has become rather widely known as the Garay grant. By a decree of March 1 and a contract made the following day, Santa Anna, who was at that time virtually a dictator, granted José de Garay the privilege of constructing a way of communication across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and gave him in fee simple all the unoccupied land for ten leagues on each side of the proposed route. An important provision of the decree required the making of surveys within eighteen months and the commencement of actual work by July 1, 1844. On February 9, 1843, Garay reported to the government that he had completed the first obligation and

[8] *Transactions of the Alabama historical society*, 1904, p. 153 ff.

[9] *Senate executive documents*, 30 congress, 1 session, no. 52, p. 82 ff.

[10] *Ibid.*, 30 congress, 1 session, no. 52, p. 337.

asked to be placed in possession of his lands. This request was complied with by a decree of the same day. On October 4, three hundred convicts were provided for the work, but the following December the time for the commencement of operations was extended another year. Owing to the numerous revolutions which disturbed Mexico at the time, however, Garay was forced to ask yet another extension. Two more years were accordingly granted by another dictator, Mariano Salas. A series of contracts running through 1847 and 1848 transferred all the privileges of Garay, "without any limitation whatever," to Messrs. Manning and Mackintosh, subjects of Great Britain. They, in turn, assigned the grant to the Hargous brothers of New York, in February, 1849. Three days after obtaining it, the United States transferees had read in the senate a petition inviting attention to the merits of the project.[11]

Thus affairs stood when, on June 20, 1849, Clifford, the United States minister, in obedience to instructions from the secretary of state, addressed a note to the Mexican minister of relations, informing him that some apprehension had arisen lest Mexico should annul the Garay grant largely because citizens of the United States had acquired an interest in it. "If such should be the fact," Clifford continued, "the measure could not fail to be regarded by the President of the United States as proof of a disposition wholly at variance with the existing pacific relations between the two countries, and with the spirit and even the letter" of the treaty of 1831.[12]

In reply, the Mexican minister assured Clifford that the privilege in question had not been annulled, and that the supreme authorities of Mexico would never be influenced in the matter by "any feeling of dislike to the national character of the citizens of the United States." At the same time, however, Clifford was politely informed that the question as to the validity of the grant, or its forfeiture for noncompliance with its conditions, was exclusively a Mexican affair, "to be discussed, decided and determined, according to the laws and by the constitutionally

[11] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 132; Manuel Dublan José Mariá Lozano, *Legislación Mexicana* (Mexico, 1876 ff.), 4: 120 ff., 705, 5: 187; *Senate miscellaneous documents*, 30 congress, 2 session, no. 50.

[12] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 7. Reference is made to the most favored nation clause.

competent authorities of Mexico, to the exclusion of those of any other power."[13]

On September 18 of the same year, Secretary of State Clayton instructed Robert P. Letcher, then United States minister to Mexico, to arrange a convention with that country providing for the protection of the rights and property of the parties who desired to construct the communication. This step was essential, Clayton maintained, in order that the capitalists who were then, or who might thereafter, become interested in the contract, should proceed in good faith with an enterprise so important to the United States, to Mexico, and to the world at large. He further stated that while his government had no desire to acquire Tehuantepec, it would not guarantee Mexico's sovereignty over the isthmus, and that such a guarantee in the case of New Granada was not to be cited as a precedent, for that treaty was concluded without instructions from the department, reluctantly submitted to the senate, and hastily approved at the close of the session of 1848.

That the secretary of state gave the American company an important place in his consideration is shown by the following suggestion: "It is deemed advisable, however, before any attempt shall be made to conclude the convention with the Mexican government, that, in the name and on behalf of this government, you should enter into a contract with the holders of the grant in favor of Don José de Garay, with a view to fix the amount of tolls to be levied by that company on citizens or officers of the United States who may be passengers, and on goods transported across the isthmus on the road, railroad or canal which the company may construct."[14]

Indeed, from the very outset the object of the United States government seems to have been not so much to insure the neutrality of the communication and its free use for all nations, as to furnish protection to its subjects who held the privilege. And the determination to protect its citizens and to accomplish the enterprise by their efforts mainly occasioned the difficulty which was to bring the two countries to the verge of war.

Along with the letter of September 18, Clayton sent a draft

[13] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 9.

[14] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 11 ff.

of such a convention as he desired Letcher to sign. As this served as a basis for the negotiations of the next three years, it will be necessary to summarize its main points:

Art. I. Individuals upon whom the Mexican government may have bestowed or may bestow the privilege of constructing a road, railroad or canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, and those employed by them, shall be protected in their rights of person and property from the inception to the completion of the work.

Art. II. For this purpose either party shall be at liberty to employ such military or naval force as may be deemed necessary, which shall be hospitably received in the harbors of the isthmus, or allowed to occupy the line of the work and so much of the region adjacent thereto as may be indispensable.

Art. III. The same protection, by the same means, shall be extended to the work when it shall have been completed.

Art. IV. In entering into this compact, the United States hereby solemnly disavow any intention to acquire rights of sovereignty over the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

Art. V. Decision as to noncompliance with the terms of the grant shall be left to an arbiter. In case the decision should result in forfeiture, the property of the grantees in the work shall be sold at auction to the highest bidder.

Art. VI. No foreign government or corporation shall be allowed to purchase the property mentioned in Article V. The right to purchase the same shall accrue to individuals only. . .

Art. VIII. No higher rates shall at any time be charged for the transportation of passengers, being citizens or officers of the United States, on the road, railroad or canal referred to in this convention, than may be charged on the transportation of Mexican citizens or officers of the Mexican government, or on the property belonging to them or to that government.[15]

Letcher seems not to have entered upon these negotiations until early in March, 1850, when after a long interview with the minister of relations he submitted a rough draft. During the conference, the Mexican official insisted upon a discrimination in favor of the vessels of his countrymen. Later, after having shown the draft confidentially to the British minister, he said he would insist upon the discrimination, in order to make the treaty popular with Mexico, but he would not make it a *sine qua non*. He also told Letcher that the British minister had intimated a

[15] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 13. Article VII has been omitted as having no particular bearing on the subject in hand.

desire to join in the guarantee, and that he felt sure France and Spain would like to do the same. With reference to this last remark, Letcher answered that he was afraid of "too many cooks over a small dish," and then applied to his government for instructions regarding the matter.[16]

Clayton authorized him, by letter of April 23, to allow and invite other nations to join in the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of the proposed communication, but before the dispatch reached Mexico, Letcher had already promised to agree to a treaty, and he feared that a refusal to sign it might put an end to the negotiations, as the influences working in opposition were "quite formidable."[17]

This treaty, which on account of its negotiators may be called the Letcher-Padraza convention, was signed on June 22, 1850. Important additions and revisions were made in the original draft submitted by Clayton: 1. The United States was to lend assistance in the protection of the route only in case Mexico required it, and then only "in the manner and on the terms, and . . . for the period" which Mexico designated; and in no case was this assistance to be employed against the functionaries of the Mexican government. 2. The productions of the soil or industry of Mexico were to be charged one-fifth less toll than those of the same class belonging to the United States. 3. The United States was to join Mexico in maintaining the neutrality of the route and of the country for a distance of ten leagues on each side. 4. Other nations were to be granted the same privileges enjoyed by the United States in return for joining in the guarantee of the route. In transmitting the document to Clayton, Letcher said that it fell short of what he had desired in some particulars, but that it was the "best that could be obtained."[18] Three weeks later, he declared that it was doubtful whether the Mexican congress would ratify the treaty as it stood, since some of the leading papers of the city "were violently opposed to it."[19]

While discussions of the convention were in progress, Peter A. Hargous was drawing nearer to the council chambers of the

[16] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 16.
[17] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 20 ff.
[18] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 16.
[19] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 23.

United States government and taking American business men into his project. On February 16, 1850, he requested that passports be obtained from Mexico for several engineers, who were about to be sent to make a survey of the route. By the early part of April, Letcher had procured these. Before the close of the month, Hargous wrote Clayton again, informing him that a company of citizens of the United States residing in New Orleans was about to be formed for the purpose of obtaining the Tehuantepec privileges. He expected that these citizens would prosecute the work with "intelligence and vigor," and he hoped, therefore, that he would be pardoned the suggestion that it would be advisable for Mr. Letcher to be "officially informed of these movements . . . and instructed to lose no time . . . in bringing his negotiations to a speedy and satisfactory close."[20] The convention of June 22, moreover, contained the provision that the actual holder of the privilege give his consent to it in writing. This document was accordingly submitted to Hargous for his perusal and criticism.

On August 12, Hargous wrote out a full statement of his objections. Article IV stipulated that in no case was the assistance of the United States to be employed against a functionary of the Mexican government. This stipulation would prevent the United States from repelling or restraining such functionaries even though they should be acting contrary to the wishes and orders of the Mexican government. The clause in the same article which provided that a Mexican commissioner should reside on the line of the work, should permit an American commissioner to reside there also. Article VII provided that no foreign government or corporation should acquire the privilege, but the citizens of New Orleans had in mind to apply to the legislature of Louisiana for incorporation. Finally, he desired that the United States have an equal voice with Mexico in fixing or altering the rates of transportation, and he reminded the secretary of state that the parties interested in the privilege had been at heavy expense, that they were preparing to make a thorough survey, and, consequently, they were desirous of obtaining "some assurance from their own government" that their prop-

[20] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 18.

erty would be "protected from unjust confiscation and violence" whatever became of the proposed convention.[21]

The following day, Webster, who was now secretary of state, reassured the representative of the American interests in regard to the most important of his objections. The prohibition regarding the acquisition of the privilege by a foreign government or corporation was "applicable only to the case of sale after confiscation," and the word "foreign" meant "foreign to the parties to the treaty." If Hargous deemed these explanations satisfactory, it would be wise for him to accept the treaty as it stood. As for the United States citizens who held the grant, they could confidently rely upon their government to remonstrate against the invasion of their rights, and should this remonstrance prove insufficient, "any other means" necessary to their protection would be "authorized and employed."[22]

Replying to this note, Hargous gave his reluctant consent to the treaty as it stood, but at the same time entreated Webster to have a communication sent to the Mexican government to the effect that the United States relied upon it to give security to the property of those engaged in the enterprise, and that if this just expectation should be disappointed, the United States government would deem itself bound to "take the protection thereof in its own hands."[23]

Before the reply of Hargous came, Webster had instructed Letcher to endeavor to obtain certain modifications in the convention. With these instructions he forwarded a draft drawn in accordance with Hargous' suggestion and expressly mentioned citizens of the United States in connection with the construction of the communication. He went on, moreover, to make certain vigorous statements indicating that in case Mexico rejected the overtures, the United States would take the affair into its own hands; and remarked, in conclusion, that a hint to the effect that the money still due Mexico by the terms of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo might under the circumstances be withheld would serve to facilitate matters.[24]

[21] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 26 ff.
[22] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 26.
[23] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 28.
[24] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 27, 29 ff.

Upon receiving the draft, Letcher immediately called the attention of the minister of relations to the desired alterations, but this official persistently refused to accept the most important of them. Thereupon Letcher, at his own request, was given an interview with the president and cabinet. They likewise remained steadfast, maintaining that the proposed amendments infringed upon "the sovereignty, the honor, the dignity and the national pride" of Mexico; that to "adopt them would be at once to paralyze, to disgrace, and in short to overthrow the present administration"; that a treaty embodying these provisions would be unanimously rejected by the Mexican congress. When at length Letcher suggested that the United States was determined to take the affair into its own hands in case a satisfactory treaty was not arranged, substantially the following reply was made: "Your government is strong; ours is weak. You have the power to take the whole or any portion of our territory you may think fit; we have not the *faculty* to resist. We have done all we could do to satisfy your country and to gratify you personally. We can do no more."[25]

When he received news of the vigorous Mexican opposition to his proposed draft, Webster instructed the United States minister to effect a compromise as favorable to his government as possible, and Letcher, following out his orders, succeeded in completing the negotiations for a new treaty by January 25, 1851.[26]

Very little had been accomplished by the efforts of Letcher, for the treaty was virtually the same as that of June 22, 1850. The United States was permitted to furnish protection to the work only in case Mexico invited her, while she had been forced to yield in regard to permission for a commissioner to reside on the line of the work, in regard to participation in fixing the rate of tolls, and with reference to the express designation of American citizens as holders of the privilege.[27] This treaty, unsatisfactory as it was, received the approval of Hargous and the ratification of the United States senate. By this time, however, it had become evident that the Mexican congress was not likely to

[25] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 36 ff.
[26] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 41, 44.
[27] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 43, 47 ff.

approve any treaty which would make it possible for Americans to carry out the stipulations of the Garay grant.

As early as January 17, 1851, Letcher had reported that opposition to the treaty was "violent from almost every quarter." The clergy, the interests connected with rival routes, prominent men of state, and foreign influence, all were hostile. Only the new president, Arista, manifested a friendliness toward it, and he was accused of desiring to cede a portion of the country to the United States.[28] During the following month, Buckingham Smith, United States chargé *ad interim*, reported that the people of Mexico had become no more favorably inclined toward the convention, while on April 1 he said that, according to current opinion, the treaty could in no way or shape receive the ratification of the Mexican congress. There was not a member of the cabinet who favored it, and all agreed that "the experiment with Texas should be enough." If their neighbors were given "a foothold in Tehuantepec" they would seize "one-half of the remaining territory of the republic."[29]

It is not surprising, therefore, that when Webster transmitted Hargous' letter of approval to the Mexican legation at Washington, De la Rosa, the Mexican minister, declared he had no instructions regarding the matter and, consequently, would probably not communicate the letter to his government. Pursuant to advices he received later, however, De la Rosa addressed to the United States secretary a rather lengthy note in which he sought to draw a clear line of demarcation between what he considered two entirely different and independent subjects: "the treaty concluded with the government of the United States for the purpose of facilitating an inter-oceanic communication through the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, and the grants . . . in favor of Don José de Garay. . . Whether the aforesaid contractor still preserves any right to profit by the grants which the Mexican government has made in his favor . . . or whether he has forfeited such rights, is a point which will have to be decided by the supreme government of Mexico, to which tribunal . . . this matter has been referred." As for the communication itself, De la Rosa was anxious to see the enter-

[28] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 41.

[29] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 43, 45.

prise brought to a successful conclusion, and he hoped no question concerning private interests would frustrate or delay "one of the most magnificent undertakings that ever was devised on the face of the earth."[30]

This stand on the part of the Mexican minister seemed to arouse the ire of Webster and he responded with a long and vigorous note. He began by expressing surprise at the attitude of the Mexican government, and then launched into an argument in favor of the American holders of the grant. "Citizens of the United States have embarked their fortunes upon their reliance on the good faith of both governments. They have trusted to the decrees and plighted faith of Mexico. . . They have already expended great sums of money in commencing the undertaking. More than fifty surveyors and attendants are now on the route of survey, who went thither with the express sanction of the Mexican government. More than a hundred thousand dollars have already been advanced by the company associated with the holders of the grant."

The grounds of Webster's contention were: 1. The several decrees of Mexico making and extending the grant and the contract between Garay and the Mexican government. 2. The note of the Mexican commissioners to Trist in which they informed him that a privilege in regard to the matter had been conferred upon a Mexican citizen who, with the consent of the Mexican government, had transferred it to English subjects whose rights must be respected. 3. The letter of Clifford to Lacunza, the Mexican minister of relations, giving him notice that American citizens had acquired the Garay privilege and that any infringement of their rights would be regarded with dissatisfaction on the part of the United States government. 4. The letter of Manning and Mackintosh to Lacunza (July 25, 1849) notifying him that their rights had been transferred to United States citizens. 5. The dispatch of Lacunza to Letcher (April 5, 1850) showing that the Mexican government had given orders for the hospitable reception of the American engineers appointed to survey the route. 6. Certain articles (I, V, XI, XII) of the two treaties which the Mexican agent had been willing to negotiate and which showed that Mexico recognized the validity and as-

[30] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 44, 54 ff.

signability of the Garay grant. In conclusion, Webster called the attention of De la Rosa to the "serious embarrassments" which failure to ratify the treaty might cause, and expressed the hope that the "calamity" of its rejection might be avoided.[31]

The affair was further complicated and Mexican opposition further augmented by the activities of the American holders of the Garay privilege. During the year 1850, Hargous had succeeded in interesting the people of New Orleans, who had chosen a "permanent committee" to take the enterprise in hand. This body agreed to form a company with a capital of $9,000,000, one-third of which was to be issued to Hargous in payment for his privileges. They appealed to the governor of Louisiana to call a special session of the legislature to incorporate the concern, but he declined to assist them. Undaunted, however, they formed a temporary organization, opened an office for the issuance of stock, dispatched a company of engineers to the isthmus, and prepared to finance the enterprise in part by the sale of lands in the ten league strip adjacent to the proposed communication.[32]

The engineers of the company arrived at the isthmus in December, 1850, and disposal of the land adjacent to the route probably began as early as March of the following year. On the seventh of that month De la Rosa spoke of men who were "projecting enterprises in Tehuantepec" when they had no right whatever to dispose of the lands on the isthmus, or its rivers, or its forests; and gave notice that any individuals or families who should go, or who had already gone, to settle there as colonists or proprietors of lands, would be treated as "trespassers upon the national domain."[33] On July 3, he declared that those who pretended to have succeeded Garay in his rights had contemptuously and almost derisively disposed of the lands, rivers, and woods on the isthmus. Moreover, "some of the Newspapers in New Orleans, and from other points in the United States . . . dwelt continuously on this undertaking, and almost invariably spoke of it, not as a legal enterprise, undertaken with the consent of the Mexican government, but rather as an

[31] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 60 ff.

[32] *De Bow's review*, old series, 10: 94 ff; Pierce Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin* (Philadelphia, 1907), 125.

[33] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 57.

acquisition which ought to be made of a portion of Mexican territory."[34]

De la Rosa asserted that the conduct of the so-called American grantees led the chambers to a resolution to consider the matter thoroughly, and to adopt means for preventing a repetition of the Texas event. This is perhaps an exaggeration. Reference has already been made to the note of Letcher (July 13, 1850) stating that there was opposition to the first Letcher-Pedraza convention. Even before this date, and before the Garay privilege had fallen into the hands of Hargous, a prominent Mexican statesman had expressed fear lest the United States should acquire the grant, while in February and March, 1851, steps had been taken which would interfere with the operation of the vessels of the New Orleans company.[35]

As a matter of fact, Mexico watched with great uneasiness every action of the United States government and citizens. In the recent war it had lost half of its territory, and yet its despoiler seemed unsatisfied. It therefore interpreted every movement which could be considered at all aggressive on the part of its neighbors as the beginning of the last act in the drama of its absorption. It was unfortunate for the New Orleans company that it moved in an atmosphere thus charged with suspicion.

In the early spring of 1851, the United States chargé, Smith, had been informed that the Mexican government would not allow foreign vessels to enter the ports of the isthmus "under any circumstances," and the Mexican vice-consul at New Orleans had been directed to deny the American company all communication with the isthmus. But the company insisted on its right to proceed with operations. Accordingly, the steamer *Gold Hunter* was dispatched from San Francisco for Ventosa in the state of Oaxaca. When it arrived there, April 6, the cargo and passengers, after being detained several days, were eventually forbidden a landing. In consequence, the captain declared that he had been subjected to heavy and unnecessary expenses and demanded damages from the Mexican government.[36]

[34] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 81.

[35] *Dictamen de la comisión especial de Tehuantepec del senado*, March 22, 1851 (Mexico, 1852), 22, 31.

[36] *Ibid.*, 22; *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 68 ff.

Soon afterwards, the schooner *Sears* proceeded without clearance papers from New Orleans. Touching at Vera Cruz on May 2, it asked permission to continue the voyage to the Coatzacoalcos river with supplies for the surveying party. "After several denials" it was at length "allowed to proceed, paying duties on her articles; but it was not until after some delay" and much trouble to the United States chargé.[37]

The Mexican senate had by this time reviewed the entire Tehuantepec affair and had reported in favor of declaring null and void the Salas decree of November 5, 1846, which had allowed Garay an additional two years for beginning operations, on the ground that the provisional government at that time did not have the power to dictate it. The action of the company served to precipitate matters, so that the report was almost unanimously acted upon and the decree in question was nullified May 22, 1851.[38]

On the same day, the minister of relations instructed the governor of Oaxaca to suspend the survey of the isthmus and to expel, if necessary, the laborers of the company. Notice of these orders was served on the surveyors and steps were immediately taken to stop the progress of operations. When news of the affair reached Webster, he protested against the action of the Mexican congress as unconstitutional, and expressed the hope that Mexico would reconsider and reverse this law which it had passed with haste and under "an entire misapprehension" of the consequences which might result. The New Orleans company, insisting likewise upon its rights, continued to dispatch vessels to the isthmus, and rumors spread abroad to the effect that five hundred laborers were being collected for the purpose of taking possession by force.[39]

The Mexican press then took up the affair, quoting from the United States expansionists, writing editorials on the "threatened absorption of the Spanish race by the Anglo-American," and keeping the Mexican people in general alarm while exhorting them to unity in order to resist the onslaught of the colossus

[37] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 52 ff., 75.

[38] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 85; *Dictamen de la comisión especial de Tehuantepec del senado*, March 22, 1851, p. 51.

[39] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 80 ff.; *El Universal*, July 30, 31, 1851.

of the north, which recognized no law except that of the most powerful.[40]

The Mexican government, thus backed by popular feeling, remained firm. When news of the threats of the New Orleans company reached President Arista, he sent to the American chargé asking for a conference. The desired interview took place on August 1, and, on the following day, Smith reported the result to his government: "I found him [Arista] quite calm, and he said directly that things appeared to be very threatening in the North . . . I told him that I had received no dispatches from Washington, and that I had in no way understood that the United States had any part in these movements to which he referred. . . During the interview I asked him if the bill for the military colonies at Tehuantepec had been signed, and he said that it had. . . The president added that he must obey the law and the judgment of Congress on the Garay grant. I asked if there were troops at the Coatzacoalcos river, and he said there were twelve hundred under orders to march to that point."[41]

Besides the establishment of military colonies, other preparations were made. "The headquarters of the comandencia general of Vera Cruz were moved to Acayucan . . . the national guard of the adjoining states was enlisted and ordered to be in readiness; arms were distributed and four vessels stationed off the Goazacoalco."[42] Furthermore, in order that there should be left no pretense for Americans to visit the isthmus, the *exequaturs* of the United States consuls at Ventosa and Minatitlan were taken away.[43]

The Carbajal revolt[44] on the Rio Grande frontier, attributed as it was to citizens of the United States, of course added fuel to the flame of Mexican suspicion and indignation; and Letcher, who had now returned to his post, yielded to the request of the Mexican minister of relations for the negotiation of a new treaty, while he, at the same time, signed a protocol proroguing the date

[40] *El Universal*, July 9, August 10, 1851; *El Siglo XIX*, October 6, 1851; *El Omnibus*, July 17, 1852.

[41] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 89.

[42] Hubert H. Bancroft, *History of Mexico* (San Francisco, 1883-1887), 5: 590.

[43] *Senate reports*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 355, p. 11; *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 95.

[44] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 101, 110, 125.

for the ratification of the treaty of January 25, until April 8, 1852.[45]

It soon became evident, however, that nothing would come of these new attempts. At first Ramírez, the Mexican minister of relations, showed a disposition to recognize the New Orleans company to the extent of giving it a preference in the bids for the enterprise, and submitted a draft embracing this proposal;[46] but he soon suffered a change of mind. On February 14, 1852, Letcher reported that he was satisfied he could neither negotiate an acceptable new treaty, nor obtain satisfactory changes in the old; that it was the "deliberate aim of the government and of Congress to reject the treaty"; but that he was determined Mexico should "have a full view of the dangerous precipice over which" it stood.[47]

President Fillmore then attempted to pour oil on the troubled waters, waiving, as he said, "the ceremony of diplomatic intercourse" in order to address to the Mexican president an unofficial note regarding the difficulties between the two countries. In this dispatch Fillmore called attention to the importance of the Tehuantepec communication to the United States, and to Mexico especially, but he laid most weight upon the rights of the holders of the Garay grant:

I beg leave most earnestly to call the attention of your Excellency to the probable difficulties that may grow up between the two nations, should Mexico break her plighted faith in the grant to Garay. Our citizens, relying upon her good faith, have become interested in that grant; they have advanced large sums of money for the purpose of carrying out its object; they have surveyed a route for a railroad, and demonstrated the practicability of constructing it; and it is not possible that they should now be deprived of privileges guaranteed by that grant, and sustain the heavy losses that must ensue, without appealing to their own government for the enforcement of their rights. My anxious desire is to avoid the too probable consequences that must result from such an appeal. We cannot, if we would, be indifferent to it . . . I have but a few months to remain at the head of this government, when my responsibility will cease, and this difficult and complicated matter will devolve upon some other agent. I can assure you that my love for my own country,

[45] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 112.

[46] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 121.

[47] *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 112 ff.

as well as my sincere desire to promote the prosperity of yours, induces me most earnestly to urge upon your Excellency to leave nothing undone to adjust the controversy upon the subject.[48]

Fillmore's letter, however, arrived at the Mexican capital too late to influence the deliberations which were taking place. Ramírez's open declaration of his intention to oppose the ratification of the treaty and his publication of a memorial defending the action of Mexico in refusing to recognize the Garay grant so exasperated Letcher that he addressed a long and vigorous note to the minister censuring the publication and distribution of the memorial as unprecedented in the "annals of negotiation," reiterating the determination of the United States to stand by its citizens, and requesting that the treaty in question be submitted to congress.[49] This request was thereupon complied with and, as was to be expected, congress almost unanimously rejected the convention.[50]

Fillmore's communication reached Arista on April 14; and — in order, as he said, to forestall so far as possible the disagreeable impressions which the news of the rejection of the treaty might produce — the Mexican president replied immediately. He assured Fillmore that the question of a communication through Tehuantepec certainly could not produce any difficulty between the two countries, since Mexico had always desired to see the enterprise consummated. The real difficulty, as it appeared to him, lay in the obstinacy with which the New Orleans company insisted upon the validity of the Garay grant. It had been proposed to Letcher that these pretensions be abandoned, and that the company apply directly to Mexico for another concession. At first the United States minister seemed disposed to accept this method of settlement, but soon afterwards, "to the astonishment and regret of all," he demanded that the treaty of January 25, be submitted to the approval of the Mexican congress as it stood. Such a course of action seemed to warrant the conclusion that the "object particularly aimed at was an occasion to bring the two countries into conflict." More recently, Mr. Letcher had given offense to the minister of rela-

[48] *Senate executive documents,* 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 157.
[49] *Ibid.,* 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 129 ff.
[50] *Ibid.,* 32 congress 1 session, no. 97, p. 128.

tions, and therefore it had been determined to refer the matter to the government of the United States. With a view to this, Señor Don Manuel Larrainzar had been dispatched to Washington with a full history of recent occurrences. In order, moreover, that Fillmore might know the "true history of this affair, traced from the fountain head and supported by authentic documents," a copy of the memorial of Ramírez was enclosed, with the hope that he might give it a careful perusal, bearing in mind that he was "accountable to God and to the world" for the use of the "power entrusted to his hands."[51]

Before tracing the further progress of the affair, it will be necessary to consider for a moment the reasons Mexico gave for the attitude it assumed. The strongest *exposé* of its viewpoint is set forth in the publication of Ramírez to which reference has been made. All other arguments in its defense, whether by Mexicans or Americans, are, for the most part, based upon it.

Briefly, the main contentions of this document were as follows: 1. The Salas decree of prorogation (November 5, 1846) was invalid on account of not having been submitted to congress for its approval. 2. The privilege which the Mexican commissioners mentioned in 1847 had reference only to colonization, for English subjects had not yet obtained the concession for constructing the communication. 3. As soon as the Mexican government received information that Manning and Mackintosh had procured the privilege of opening the line of communication, it informed them (by note of March 8, 1849) that they would not be recognized as the transferees because the privilege in question had already been forfeited for noncompliance with its terms. 4. The same information was sent through the Mexican minister at Washington to Garay, who was at that time in New York. 5. Permission to survey the isthmus was granted to the citizens of the United States as a matter of courtesy to a scientific commission and could therefore not be taken as a proof that Mexico recognized the holders of the Garay grant. 6. Even if the New Orleans company did have a legal right to the grant, they would be forced under its terms to become Mexican citizens,

[51] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 159 ff. For the somewhat undignified correspondence between Ramírez and Letcher, see *Senate reports*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 355, p. 14 ff.

and as such would have no right to appeal to the United States government.[52]

All these arguments were answered in some detail by champions of the United States holders of the grant: 1. It seemed strange to them that of all the decrees of Salas only that of November 5, 1846, was nullified. 2. The United States did not ask any rights of colonization but only a grant of free passage, and it was this point the Mexican commissioners said they could not concede on account of the rights of British subjects. 3. Documentary evidence showed that the conditions of the Garay grant had been complied with. 4. The Mexican government knew that the persons to whom it gave passports for the survey of the proposed route were the actual holders of the privileges of constructing the communication. 5. The denationalizing clause referred only to those who settled upon the lands adjacent to the line of communication.[53]

It is unnecessary to enter into the merits of the respective contentions. The important fact for the historian is that the president and state department of the United States, apparently thinking they had a just cause against Mexico, were, at the time, prepared to support the claims of the American citizens by force if necessary, while the Mexican government was as determined to resist what it considered an encroachment upon its territory.[54] With reference to the outcome, there was still to be almost another year of suspense.

Notwithstanding the refusal of the Mexican congress to ratify the convention of January 25, 1851, the United States still clung to the opinion that Mexico, influenced by fear of the consequences, would yet agree to a satisfactory settlement. It was reported that Larrainzar came from Mexico with instructions to take up the matter anew, but his letter written to Webster on

[52] *Memoria instructiva de los derechos y justas causas que tiene el gobierno de los Estados-Unidos Mexicanos para no reconocer ni la subsistencia del privilegio concedido a Don Jose Garay . . . ni la legitimidad de la cesion que aquel hizo del mismo privilegio a cuidadanos de los Estados-Unidos de la America del Norte* (Mexico, 1852). For other defenses see *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, pp. 81 ff., 141 ff., *passim*.

[53] *A review of the Tehuantepec controversy* (Georgetown, D. C., 1853).

[54] The claims filed by Hargous in the name of the Tehuantepec company were disallowed by the joint claims commission created in 1868. *Senate executive documents*, 44 congress, 2 session, no. 31, p. 18 ff.

July 10 showed that these hopes were unfounded, and negotiations accordingly ceased.[55]

It now became congress' turn to take up the matter. On July 19, 1852, Mason of Virginia brought forward a resolution calling upon the president for the correspondence relating to the Tehuantepec negotiations, and it was unanimously approved. On July 27, the president responded, and the correspondence was submitted immediately to the committee on foreign affairs. On August 30, this committee submitted along with their report three resolutions declaring: 1. That it was not "compatible with the dignity" of the United States government to "prosecute the subject further by negotiation." 2. That any renewal of negotiations should only be acceded to in case the proposition from Mexico was not inconsistent with the demands of the United States in regard to the Garay grant. 3. That the United States stood committed to the protection of the rights of her citizens, and should Mexico "within a reasonable time, fail to reconsider her position concerning said grant" it would become necessary for the United States to take remedial action.[56]

Senator Brooke of Mississippi introduced at the same time an informal resolution proposing that Mexico be given only until March 1 to put the American holders in possession of their property and franchises.[57]

As this session of congress closed on August 31, no action was taken except to table the resolution, but the matter was given considerable attention during the early part of the next session, Seward of New York and Hale of Connecticut opposing the resolutions, while Mason of Virginia, Downs of Louisiana, and Brooke of Mississippi spoke in their favor. These discussions revealed the fact that war with Mexico was by no means as imminent as it had seemed. Not only were those who favored rival routes jealous of the Tehuantepec interests, but even the supporters of the resolutions, having no idea that war would result, apparently urged the matter as a sort of bluff. In the event it failed to work, they were of the opinion that the American com-

[55] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 129; *ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 2.

[56] *Senate reports*, 32 congress, 2 session, no. 355, p. 6.

[57] *Congressional globe*, 32 congress, 1 session, 1833, 2465.

pany could yet be put in possession of their rights without causing an actual rupture.[58]

Though a portion of the Mexican press continued to utter forebodings of an Anglo-American invasion, it is probable that the government itself, being well informed regarding the state of public mind in the United States, still hoped for a peaceful issue. United States private interests had been largely responsible for the strained relations; might they not also be made to furnish a way of escape? As early as August, 1851, the editor of *El Universal* had seen a "ray of hope" in the fact that such an expansionist organ as the *New York Herald* had begun to champion the Vanderbilt projects in Nicaragua.[59] Soon afterwards, letters from "kind-hearted gentlemen" of New York, Washington, and other places began to come in, advising the Arista administration to reject the Tehuantepec treaty by all means and leading them to think that such a step might, after all, not be attended by serious consequences.[60] Even before the rejection took place, A. G. Sloo of New York had been introduced to prominent Mexican men of state.[61] Articles, written by one B. E. Green to the *New York Herald* in the fall of 1852 and violently opposing the New Orleans company, had found their way into the Mexican archives, as had also a letter addressed by Thomas Benton to his constituents.[62] Mexico, therefore, seems to have decided to give further impulse to this rivalry by bestowing a privilege regarding Tehuantepec upon Sloo.[63]

The Mexican government was determined, however, to avoid if possible the dangers to which the Garay grant had given rise. Accordingly, no lands for colonization were included, rigorous provisions regarding the introduction of armed force were made, the holders were forbidden recourse except to Mexican courts, and one-third of the company's stock was held for six months at the disposal of Mexican purchasers, while the Mexican gov-

[58] *Congressional globe*, 32 congress, 2 session, 365, 468, 469, 537, 628, appendix 134 ff., 160 ff.

[59] *El Universal*, August 23, 24, 1851.

[60] *Senate executive documents*, 32 congress, 1 session, no. 97, p. 104.

[61] *El Siglo XIX*, January 13, 1853. *El Universal*, April 24, 1852, contained an article advocating a mixed company.

[62] *Archivo-Mexicano. Actas de las sesiones de las camaras*, 1852 (Mexico, 1852), 1: 109 ff., 275 ff.

[63] Consult *El Universal*, November 29, 1852, January 13, 14, February 7, 1853; *El Siglo XIX*, January 11, 1853.

ernment was also to be a shareholder. Another item which must have been of some importance to Mexico at the time was the agreement that the company should pay $600,000 for the cession.[64] Finally, there seemed to be a secret provision stipulating that the new company should stand between the Mexican government and the New Orleans company.[65]

The death of Webster, moreover, seemed to remove another difficulty. His term as secretary of state had been characterized by vigor, and the New Orleans company had found in him a faithful and able champion; but no sooner had Conrad—who succeeded to Webster's duties during his last illness—taken up the pen, than he addressed a letter to Conkling, who had been appointed to take Letcher's place as Mexican minister, showing a disposition to give in to Mexico. Conkling was told not to reopen negotiations, but to ascertain if possible what were the objections of Mexico to the Garay grant and to persuade the New Orleans company to dispense with or modify the obnoxious clauses. If Mexico's pride should not permit her to recognize the Garay privilege in any form, he was cautiously to sound the government upon the question of ceding the right of way to the United States.[66] These instructions clearly indicated a moderation of feeling, and Conkling, upon arriving in Mexico, manifested a friendly disposition. The attitude which the democratic administration would assume when it entered upon its duties in March, 1853, now became an important consideration.

Although the Mexican press had seen in the Sloo grant what was termed a way of escape, there was still considerable uneasiness in regard to the "loco-focos." It was quite the fashion of this party while parading under the name of "Young America" to denounce the foreign policy of the whigs as lacking in force and decision and to declare the absorption of the entire continent the destiny of their nation. Of such a tenor were articles contained in the *Democratic review* for January and June, 1852. The first of these ridiculed the whig administration's foreign policy in general, censuring it, among other things, for allowing American citizens in "defiance of public and private purchase" to be driven from Tehuantepec. The other, in commenting upon

[64] *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 21 ff.
[65] *Ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, pp. 5, 39.
[66] *Ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 12 ff.

the expansionist plank in the democratic platform, declared that it meant full expansion and a vigorous policy both in regard to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and Panama.[67] Other opponents of this expansionist sentiment were the *Washington Republic* and the *New York Herald*, and it was often given vigorous expression in the halls of congress and at banquets given in honor of democratic statesmen.

El Universal, the leading Mexican conservative paper of the time, took upon itself the special task of keeping watch over the movements of the democrats. On November 26, 1852, the editor of this sheet declared that the dangers from the north had increased since the "demagogical party" had come into power and expressed the fear that Pierce, like Polk, would take advantage of Mexico's dissensions to rob it of its territory. On March 30, 1853, it quoted a letter from the *New Orleans Picayune* asserting that the Tehuantepec affair would be one of the first considerations of the new administration.[68] These and similar articles must have served to keep up a state of considerable uneasiness in Mexico.

The democratic administration, however, showed surprising indifference regarding the Tehuantepec affair. On March 21, 1853, Conkling had concluded a convention in regard to the Sloo grant, but when it was transmitted to Pierce, he did not see fit to submit it to congress.[69] Neither did the resolutions of the committee on foreign relations ever come up again for consideration. Marcy's instructions to Gadsden, the successor of Conkling, mentioned the matter only to tell him not to enter into any negotiations for the time being.[70] This attitude is probably explained by the increasing and overshadowing popularity of routes proposed to be constructed entirely within United States territory.[71]

[67] *Democratic review*, 31: 2, 492.

[68] For further quotations and comment upon this expansion sentiment, see almost any issue of *El Universal* during 1852 and 1853; *Eco de España*, October 15, 19, 1853; *El Siglo XIX*, April to December, 1853.

[69] *Senate executive journal*, 9: 240 ff.

[70] *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 32.

[71] Lewis H. Haney, *Congressional history of railways in the United States to 1850* (*University of Wisconsin bulletin*, no. 211 — Madison, 1908), 147. In his annual message of 1853, Pierce expressed the opinion that the routes within the United States would prove more practicable than any of those across the isthmus. James

The Gadsden treaty, however, "originally contained two articles protecting claimants against Mexico and specifically naming the Garay grant," but the senate threw out these provisions.[72] The eighth article of that treaty as finally ratified referred to the Sloo grant and provided for the transportation across the isthmus free of duty of United States mail and merchandise in bond; likewise for the unobstructed passage of United States troops and munitions, and for the extension of United States' protection at the latter's discretion.[73]

For the next three years the matter did not again enter the fields of diplomacy, but the actual work on the route made very little progress. The Sloo, or "Mixed company" as it was sometimes called, had no funds, and was forced to borrow the $600,000 to make the necessary payments to the Mexican government. The loan was obtained from a British subject and secured by a lien on the grant. Peter A. Hargous, still game in spite of his former difficulties, managed to obtain this lien. The Sloo interests, on the other hand, proceeded to have themselves incorporated as the Louisiana Tehuantepec company and, ignoring the lien as well as the secret clause providing for the indemnification of the former company, set to work on the plank road stipulated in the Sloo contract with Mexico. Moreover, the Savannah convention which met in December, 1856, indorsed their proposition after a favorable report had been made by a special investigating committee.[74]

Hargous, however, soon began to give them trouble. On March 31, 1856, his attorney addressed a letter to Gadsden informing him that on November of the preceding year Hargous had entered into an agreement with Falconnet, the British subject who had advanced Sloo the loan, whereby he had acquired all the rights of the former; that these rights, according to the agreement under which the loan was made, embraced the entire control of the privilege; that the Mexican government had recognized Falconnet as the sole owner of the privilege in ques-

D. Richardson, *Compilation of the messages and papers of the presidents, 1789-1897* (Washington, 1896-1898), 5: 221 ff.

[72] Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 133; *Senate executive journal*, 9: 291, 299.

[73] William M. Malloy, *Treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols and agreements between the United States of America and other powers, 1776-1909* (Washington, 1910), 1: 1124, article VIII.

[74] *De Bow's review*, old series, 22: 99, 193 ff.

tion; and finally, that, contrary to the express agreement which authorized Falconnet, in case the loan was not repaid, to dispose of it without the intervention of judiciary authority, the Mexican government had refused to recognize the transfer to Hargous. The attorney, therefore, respectfully requested that Gadsden take measures effectively to protect the rights of Hargous, and to "insure his acknowledgment by the Mexican government as owner of the privilege."[75]

But Gadsden, as Hargous thought, assumed an attitude of "lukewarmness, if indeed not of actual hostility." He therefore appealed to Secretary of State Marcy, summing up the situation in the following paragraph:

It will, of course, be obvious to you that as all the rights of the citizens of the United States in the Sloo grant were extinguished by its transfer to Mr. Falconnet, who is a British subject, it must remain in the possession of the latter until his transfer to me shall be approved by the Mexican government. It is unquestionably, I should suppose, the policy and interest of our government that citizens of the United States and not British subjects should have exclusive control of the privilege referred to. If, therefore, the Mexican government shall be countenanced in much longer delaying my request, the danger to [which] the policy and interests to which I have adverted will be subjected is submitted to your wise consideration.[76]

In the late summer of 1856, Gadsden was succeeded by John Forsyth. He was instructed to call the attention of Mexico to the deep interest felt by the government and people of the United States in the completion of the communication across Tehuantepec and to request that the Mexican government use all its power to remove the obstacles which lay "in the way of giving effect to" the disputed grant.[77] Forsyth went to Mexico with the determination that the legation while under his charge should not be made an attorney's office for either of the rival American claimants and that he should not take sides with either in the dispute,[78] but he was later to find that this attitude of neutrality was to cause him no little trouble.

At length the president and directors of the Sloo company (since 1853 the Louisiana Tehuantepec company) managed to

[75] *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 33 ff.
[76] *Ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 35.
[77] *Ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 36.
[78] *Ibid.*

patch up an agreement with Hargous whereby a new Louisiana Tehuantepec company was formed with Judah P. Benjamin as attorney and Emile la Sère as president. Benjamin succeeded in getting an interview with Buchanan through their common friend Slidell, and on August 2, the Louisiana senator and the president of the new company set sail for Mexico, bearing lengthy instructions from the state department to Forsyth. Pierre Soulé, who had been chosen as representative of a "rebellious faction of the extinct Sloo company," managed to secure passage on the same steamer.

These instructions, which gossip declared to have been written not by the "superannuated old fogy" Cass but by the president himself, authorized Forsyth to enter into a treaty for the purpose of confirming, extending, and rendering more specific the provisions of the eighth article of the treaty of December 30, 1853. The United States minister was further requested to make known to the Mexican government the mission of La Sère and Benjamin and to assist them in obtaining the modifications which they desired in the Sloo grant, provided such modifications were not contrary to the draft of a treaty which was being forwarded.

When the agents of the new company reached Mexico, they apparently labored to magnify their mission, Benjamin boasting that he carried the Buchanan administration in his pocket and that he had secret and ample powers which made him and not Forsyth the true representative of the United States government in regard to the Tehuantepec question. Forsyth accordingly declined to coöperate with La Sère and Benjamin. Soulé, moreover, seems to have caused them some trouble; but, in spite of opposition, they succeeded in procuring a contract from President Comonfort on September 7, 1857. To this contract Forsyth interposed his objections on the ground that it jeopardized American interests on the isthmus, violated the instructions of the secretary of state, and secured to his government no benefit. At the same time, he attempted to negotiate a treaty with respect to the transit more favorable than the eighth article of the Gadsden treaty. Failing in this as well as other important matters, he soon returned to the United States.[79]

[79] *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, pp. 50, 138, 142; *ibid.*, 35 congress, 2 session, no. 1, p. 41 ff.

The Washington government, now probably convinced that it could expect nothing from the conservative faction of Mexico, sent William M. Churchill as confidential agent to the Juárez government. He soon reported that Juárez was favorably inclined, and thereupon it was decided to send an envoy clothed with full powers. For this duty Robert M. McLane of Maryland was chosen. He was instructed to procure, among other things, perpetual rights of way not only across Tehuantepec, but over two other routes as well. Soon after his arrival at Vera Cruz he concluded to recognize the constitutionalists, citing as one of the factors influencing his decision the readiness of that government to protect "the very large interests . . . involved in the rights of way over Tehuantepec."[80]

McLane had received his appointment on March 7, 1858, and before the close of the following year he had negotiated what was called the McLane-Ocampo treaty, by the terms of which the United States obtained rights of way and valuable transit privileges not only across Tehuantepec, but from the lower Rio Grande to Mazatlan, and from Rancho de Nogales to Guaymas. The gathering war cloud prevented this treaty from being ratified by the senate of the United States, however, and the matter passed, so far as this paper is concerned, from the field of diplomacy.[81]

The Louisiana Tehuantepec company, with its cession of September, 1857, from the Comonfort government, experienced "a brief season of apparent prosperity. . . Benjamin raised funds and actually got built a practicable road for vehicles across the Isthmus. He coaxed a reluctant Postmaster-General into granting a contract to carry the California mails via Tehuantepec, for one year, commencing November 1, 1858. The company provided the steamship *Quaker City*, and she started on her maiden trip from New Orleans to Minatitlan, October 27, 1858. There was great jollification and congratulation. And there were more trips of the *Quaker City*, and the mail came through from California in twelve days less than by any other route. Then suddenly followed the evil days — Hargous Brothers

[80] James M. Callahan, "The Mexican policy of southern leaders under Buchanan's administration," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1910, p. 142.

[81] *Ibid.*; John Musser, *The establishment of Maximilian's empire in Mexico* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1918), 25.

floundering in financial bogs; the company well-nigh ruined; Mr. Benjamin, armed with personal letters to the Barings and others from Slidell and from the Chief Executive himself, wasting his summer vacation (1859) in the effort to get financial aid in Europe."[82] It became necessary, too, to obtain an extension of time from Mexico. This the company succeeded in doing on March 28, 1859, and again in October, 1860. Even then, however, it was unable to meet the conditions of its contract and the grant was eventually nullified on October 15, 1866.[83]

J. Fred Rippy

University of California
Berkeley, California

[82] Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin*, 189; *Senate executive documents*, 35 congress, 1 session, no. 72, p. 60.

[83] Dublan y Lozano, *Legislación Mexicana*, 8: 666, 756; 9: 734.

DANIEL WOLSEY VOORHEES

The men who represented the middle west in congress during the civil war have never been adequately studied. In them existed both extremes of political opinion, separated by the apparently unbridgeable gulf common in times of war and significant from the fact that in the ranks of congress, from Lovejoy to Vallandigham, are seen more or less accurately reflected important elements of the sentiment of the country. In many cases, moreover, these men in the sixties were only beginning a long political career, during which they steadily exemplified certain abiding interests, classes, or points of view. Of such, in the "pivotal" and normally democratic state of Indiana, was Daniel Wolsey Voorhees.

Voorhees was born in Ohio in 1827. His parents were both Americans by birth, his father of Dutch, his mother of Irish stock. The westward migration, so common in the history of men born at this time, took place when he was two months old, and his family settled on a farm in Fountain county, in the central and western portion of Indiana. The boy was brought up on this farm, and though he early evinced more of a taste for books than for profitable labor, he always considered himself as essentially belonging to the farming class. In 1849 he was graduated from Indiana Asbury (now De Pauw) university, entered a law office for a brief period, and after a successful partnership with a man much his senior became prosecuting attorney for the circuit court in 1853. There is no record of Voorhees ever having had any doubts as to his political preferences: he was a democrat from beginning to end. In 1856 he was the democratic candidate for congress in his district, but was defeated by a small margin. President Buchanan not long afterward appointed him United States district attorney for Indiana, in which capacity he served from 1858 to 1861. It was in 1857 that Voorhees moved to Terre Haute, the largest and most important town

in western Indiana, and it was his home from that time until his death.[1]

In 1860 Voorhees was elected to the house of representatives on the democratic ticket. Before turning to his political career during the civil war, it is proper to inquire about the man and his opinions on the subjects of the day. He was over six feet in height, weighing two hundred pounds, very erect, and with fair hair and "dark-grey hazel" eyes. He had married in 1850. He was frank and aggressive, of an intense and eager nature, prone to express itself in superlatives, yet with a sense of humor which almost belied certain of his political speeches. His sympathies were very ready, and he is found in congress almost invariably supporting and frequently introducing multifarious bills for the relief of private persons. One of his republican colleagues was able to say of him that, if he could not be depended upon to protect the United States treasury, at any rate he was never hesitant where his own pocketbook was concerned. It is a fact that he died poor, though his law practice was lucrative.

Voorhees was, for the most part, a fierce partisan of the Jackson school, his chief divergence consisting in a tremendous and outspoken respect for state rights, a natural position for one who, as the crisis approached, found himself in close sympathy with the south in its fear and distrust of the negro, of the hated abolitionists, and of the economic power and policies of the east. There are two public speeches of his, given before secession became a fact, which are valuable in relation to the whole question of slavery and the maintenance of the union. They were of a sort to give comfort to thinking southerners who wished to believe that secession could be peaceably achieved. The first of these speeches was delivered before a Virginia jury in 1859 in defense of one of John Brown's associates in the Harper's Ferry tragedy, John E. Cook, the brother-in-law of Governor Willard of Indiana, at whose request Voorhees undertook the case.[2] It was,

[1] This information is gathered from the biographical sketch by A. B. Carlton prefixed to Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, *Speeches* (Cincinnati, 1875); from the memoir by Judge Thomas B. Long in Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory; Daniel Wolsey Voorhees' lectures, addresses, and speeches, compiled and edited by his three sons and his daughter* (Indianapolis and Kansas City, 1898), volume 1; and from an article by W. W. Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 355. The year of Voorhees' birth is sometimes erroneously given as 1828.

[2] Printed in Voorhees, *Speeches*, and also in *Forty years of oratory*, volume 2.

says James G. Blaine, "a magnanimous act in view of the risk to his position among the pro-slavery Democracy, with whom he was strongly identified in party organization."[3] The case seems, however, to have done Voorhees no political harm, and it brought him into national prominence as an advocate. He began his plea with a defense of state rights, argued in the best southern style, and was properly emphatic for one who, although defending an abolitionist, expected to be a democratic candidate for congress in the succeeding year. Following this he proved —to his own satisfaction if not entirely to that of the jury—that slavery had been much strengthened by the episode of Harper's Ferry, and that it was now more fully vindicated than ever, since the slaves, having had the opportunity and the temptation, had utterly failed to rise. His line of defense was to put all the blame on old John Brown for contaminating the young, inexperienced, and dreamy idealist Cook, to fulminate against Brown as the leader whose corrupt mind and strong will dragged others to partake in his criminal enterprise, and finally to announce that "the soldier was never punished for the outrage of his commander." Passing on to more general considerations Voorhees attacked Seward and the "higher law," Wendell Phillips, Joshua Giddings, Charles Sumner, and others, all to the effect that the real blame for Cook's crime resided in the abolitionist teachers of the north, for whom too harsh words were not to be found.

There is another address of Voorhees, less than a year later, which hardly needs comment.[4] "The American citizen," as it was entitled, was delivered before the literary societies of the University of Virginia on July 4, 1860; it would appear from this that the defense of Cook had not injured his position in the south:

> I hold nothing in common with that false and pernicious system of political ethics which proclaims as its favorite dogma the unqualified equality of the whole human family. . . We see men in our midst, forgetful of the proud name of American citizen, and seeking to debase and tarnish the armorial bearings of the great race to which he belongs, advance the doctrine and urge the theory of absolute human equality.[5]

[3] James G. Blaine, *Twenty years of congress: from Lincoln to Garfield. With a review of the events which led to the political revolution of 1860* (Norwich, Conn., 1884-1886), 1: 329.

[4] Voorhees, *Speeches*, 27 ff.

[5] *Ibid.*, 35.

And there is more of a very caustic nature about the abolitionists, who are not, however, mentioned as such on this academic occasion. The lecturer then goes on to demonstrate that "abstract equality is visible in none of the works of God." This theme is developed for at least fifteen minutes, ending with a panegyric on "the entire supremacy of the Anglo-saxon race in all useful achievements." The supplanting of the Indians is noted as being by "the same fundamental principle which governed the settlement of Canaan by the children of Israel," with the incidental remark that "but one race was ever designed to participate in the labors, the duties, and the privileges of one government." Then comes that statement, so familiar and dear to southern hearts, and believed in because the institution it attempted to justify was threatened:

Extermination was more desirable to the haughty Red Man than subserviency; but that the philosophy and teaching of all ages, as well as the wisdom of God himself, sanction and justify the existence of a dependent and vassal condition on the part of an inferior toward a superior race where the two are brought in contact, no well-informed and impartial mind will deny. . . To my mind it is sufficiently clear that the founders of our colonies, and afterwards of our Federal Government, wisely framed and fashioned their institutions for themselves and their posterity, and proclaimed no equality, entered into no partnership, and divided no civil rights with any other race.[6]

After a discussion of the declaration of independence and its use of the word "equality," there comes the rather unsatisfactory statement that "we have seen, at last, a government here assume shape and form, founded on the philosophical relation which exists between the different races that inhabit this continent, and dedicated to the freedom and equality of its citizens."[7] After which conclusion the American government and its foremost position in the world are held forth for admiration at some length.

In this address the defense and exposition of the doctrine of state rights is marked by some rather strange history:

The American Union is the first confederation of states in the annals of mankind, where the attributes of sovereignty were allowed to remain in its individual members. Centralization of power has been the bane of every confederation of which history

[6] Voorhees, *Speeches*, 41.

[7] *Ibid.*, 44.

gives any account, and the brightest displays of learned statesmanship which this or any other age ever beheld were made by the founders of this government in originating and adopting the means whereby that rock of shipwreck and disaster might be forever avoided. . . They [the states] were the first governments of this country, and delegated, but never surrendered beyond the power of reclamation, certain of their own powers, duly and carefully specified, to the federal government in trust, and to be exercised strictly in obedience to that sacred deed of trust — the Constitution.[8]

Lastly there is an energetic, over-oratorical philippic against the "seditious citizen," who is portrayed for men's abomination as the sole cause of all the existing and impending ills of the country.[9] It is indeed a monster of fanatical disunion that is depicted, and before that Virginia audience it was not necessary to give names: those who were suggested were familiar objects of opprobrium to every southerner.

Such was the northwestern democrat as he first appeared in congress in the summer of 1861. He represented a district predominantly of southern stock and sympathies, conscious that secession was not for itself a possible question and consequently "loyal" to the union, but indisposed to quarrel with the south for leaving; at any rate desirous of conciliation and compromise. The Indiana democracy considered the "black republicans" and abolitionists of the north and especially of New England as even more responsible for the dismemberment of the union than the secessionists themselves: such northerners had forced the war on the south. These middle westerners were in many respects of the north, but they had the same attitude toward the negro as the poor whites of the south, that is, they despised and hated while being a little afraid of him, and were violently opposed to giving him any more rights and privileges than they could help.[10] From this quarter any harmony with the party supported by Giddings and Sumner was hardly to be expected. A third element in the position of the democratic party was the traditional opposition to the Yankee and New England, perhaps in part

[8] Voorhees, *Speeches*, 45.

[9] *Ibid.*, 49 ff.

[10] The situation in Illinois was almost analogous. Cf. Norman D. Harris, *History of negro servitude in Illinois, and of the slavery agitation in that state, 1719-1864* (Chicago, 1904), chapter 13.

transmitted from the south, but sufficiently explained by the inevitable relation of a large debtor class to the source of its borrowed capital, and a little later by the agricultural opposition to the protective tarriff. A fourth plank on which such democrats as Voorhees were continually taking their stand, in ringing phrases, was the constitution — strictly construed.[11] That the necessities of war led to a severe straining of the constitution cannot be denied, nor that all the traditions of the democracy were on the side of a closely limited central government,[12] but one cannot help feeling, in reading the speeches of the time, that the appeals to the constitution, often justified so far as the fate of that instrument itself was concerned,[13] were in large part mere incidents of an opposition which was inevitable from other causes.

Voorhees, a new and untried member of congress, was not heard from in 1861. His first speech was early in 1862, a temperate and forceful argument against the increasingly radical tendencies beginning to be manifest in the dominant party. He defines his own position very clearly, in terms entirely appropriate to the mass of the loyal democrats of that time, excluding only those who had practically gone over to the republicans . He promises that he will

sustain the government with all my energies in all its constitutional efforts to maintain unbroken the union of these states as our fathers made it; that I will sustain it with all my energies in so conducting this war that it shall "not be waged in the spirit of conquest or subjugation, nor for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or institutions of the states; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several states unimpaired"; but that I shall oppose unalterably, in all constitutional methods, and to the utmost of my ability, the prosecution of this war for the purpose of subjugating the southern states, reducing them to the condition of territories, subverting their institutions and laws, or liberating their slaves. This position I conceive to be one on which every lover of the

[11] The substance of this paragraph is taken largely from James A. Woodburn, "Party politics in Indiana in the civil war," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1902 (Washington, 1903), 1: 225 ff.

[12] William A. Dunning, *Essays on the civil war and reconstruction and related topics* (revised edition, New York, 1910), 1 ff.

[13] *Ibid.*, 60.

Union, every disciple of the Constitution, every friend of humanity, can stand. . . Hard words and brave threats neither weaken our enemies nor strengthen us. This war will not be brought to a close by strong expressions of hate, nor is such a course consistent with a high order of statesmanship.[14]

He is speaking for the cause of the union, but the union is dependent on the constitution, which, to his alarm, is threatened "on this floor." No separate point need be made of his fears for the constitution, real though they were. He soon found a menace in every majority measure which he opposed. He asserts that, if universal emancipation is now to be the policy of the government, "a foul deception has been practiced on the loyal people of the nation, and our army has been obtained and mustered into the field by false pretences more gross than were ever before perpetrated to obtain the means with which to carry out secret and unhallowed purposes." He appeals to the "recorded pledges of the government" not to interfere with slavery, quoting Lincoln, Seward, and B. F. Butler. He applauds McClellan's proclamation, made at the beginning of the West Virginia campaign, announcing the intention not to interfere with property in slaves, and says that it "suited the law-abiding people of the mighty Northwest. . . It was worth, sir, to the recruiting service, a hundred thousand men in the valley of the Mississippi." The spirit of abolitionism was never a friend to the union and is not now. "It is at war with the Constitution, it is an enemy to the government; it is the twin monster to the doctrine of secession, and like the withered and hateful hags on the blasted heath of Scotland, the two together concocted the hell broth of the present civil war." No measures are justified which strain the constitution. State necessity is a "strange and alarming doctrine." It is a "monstrous engine of oppression. . . It is the bloody, dripping sword of irresponsible power."

From now on his opposition became more violent, more absolute, until it seems the charge of copperheadism must be correct. Certainly Voorhees became a spokesman of the most extreme opinions which were still allowed expression in congress. His fears for the existence of the union sound, at this interval of time, like the ravings of a madman. Referring to the presi-

[14] *Congresesional globe*, 37 congress, 2 session, 903.

dential proclamation suspending the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, he says: "Condemnation without trial and punishment without limitation is the most exact definition to my mind of the most atrocious tyranny that ever feasted on the groans of the captive or banqueted on the tears of the widow and fatherless."[15] He speaks of "courtiers and parasites," of "fawning minions." "Will some poor, crawling, despised sycophant and tool of executive depotism dare to say that I shall not pronounce the name of Vallandigham? The scandal and stigma of his condemnation and banishment filled the civilized world, and the lethean and oblivious waves of a thousand years will not wash away the shame and reproach of that miserable scene from the American name."[16]

He feared that the last act in the tragedy of national honor, of national existence, was being played.[17] "This government is dying, dying, sir, dying."[18] Some of his speeches are one long wail on the sad fate of the constitution, and through all runs the theme, Behold all the incredible and awful things that have happened to the American people, subversive of every principle of historical justice, of the constitution, of the private rights of the individual; the American people will not endure them much further. The fact that the country did endure and support the policy of the administration seems to have impressed him not at all. It is only fair to say, however, that even so distinguished a judgment as that of Rhodes is that the democratic criticisms of the executive in the thirty-seventh congress "were justly taken and undoubtedly had an influence for good on the legislation."[19]

Voorhees was not invariably hectic and immoderate. He introduced a bill to increase the pay of the army.[20] Blaine notes that "among several other Democratic partisans" he voted for the bill to make Grant a lieutenant-general.[21] His speech (January, 1865) opposing the thirteenth amendment is concise and calm. He recognizes that slavery is done for and says that the

[15] *Congressional globe*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1058.

[16] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, appendix, 73.

[17] *Ibid.*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1058.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850 to the final restoration of home rule at the south in 1877* (New York, 1892-1906), 4: 229.

[20] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, 22.

[21] Blaine, *Twenty years of congress*, 1: 510.

question "is rapidly diminishing in importance." He himself is indifferent to the result, but he considers the present an improper time to amend the fundamental law of the country and holds, furthermore, "that the Constitution does not authorize an amendment to be made by which any state or citizen shall be divested of acquired rights of property or of established political franchises."[22] Voorhees was one of eight democratic absentees when the thirteenth amendment was passed; and Blaine thinks "it may be assumed that they assented to the amendment, but that they were not prepared to give it positive support."[23]

There would be small use in rehearsing further Voorhees' utterances in the house. He was considered one of the most virulent opponents of Lincoln and the administration; but although he expressed his fears of executive usurpation and of an absolute despotism most vigorously,[24] the writer has been unable to find anywhere a personal reference to Mr. Lincoln, disrespectful or otherwise. Shelby M. Cullom says: "He was a great admirer of Mr. Lincoln. He knew him well; . . . and although they belonged to opposing political parties, he evinced for Lincoln very warm feeling."[25] This view is borne out by an unfinished lecture which Voorhees was writing during his last months, in which he devotes some pages to Lincoln, whom he appreciates very quietly and justly, emphasizing his self-sufficiency without self-consciousness.

Voorhees never, throughout the war, ceased to hope for a compromise, for conciliation. He compared the administration with Attila, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and Hyder Ali, "who never said conciliate but always said crush," and he said as late as March, 1864, that peace satisfactory to the majority could be immediately negotiated.[26] His opposition to New England is shown in the ship canal debate (February 6, 1863),[27] and in many discussions of tariff and revenue bills, as well as in the manner

[22] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 2 session, 180.

[23] Blaine, *Twenty years of congress*, 1: 538.

[24] See speech on Louisiana contested election, *Congressional globe*, 37 congress, 3 session, 834.

[25] Shelby M. Cullom, *Fifty years of public service; personal recollections of Shelby M. Cullom, senior United States senator from Illinois* (second edition, Chicago, 1911), 133

[26] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, appendix, 76.

[27] *Ibid.*, 37 congress, 3 session, 768 ff.

in which he locates the wicked abolitionists in that section. His favorite opponent in the house was Mr. Dawes, a prominent member from Massachusetts, and the bickerings between the two are for a time most amusing.

Before turning to the financial questions from which may be developed another chief side of Voorhees' character as a middle western agrarian, it will be best to notice briefly his position with regard to reconstruction. It is easily to be divined, though he did not entirely escape inconsistency. In 1863 he opposed the admission to congress of representatives from Louisiana on the ground that the constitution had not been strictly followed in the manner of their choosing. "The law has been violated. And even if the people have acquiesced in a usurpation, you and I are, by our oaths, forbidden to assist them in carrying it out."[28] Strange doctrine indeed from the gentleman from Indiana! In later years he did not see reasons for denying seats to members from the south because they were elected under the proclamation of a president-appointed governor. In fact it was Voorhees who introduced, early in the first session of the notorious thirty-ninth congress, that resolution unqualifiedly endorsing President Johnson's reconstruction policy which so alarmed the extreme republicans.[29] In supporting this resolution he denied that the democrats were trying to "steal the president" as was the cry, and said that he had until recently feared that Johnson would be very obnoxious.[30] Now, however, his fears were plainly of congress and not of the executive branch, whose every act he had so violently opposed during the war. He had protested against every assumption of authority on the part of Lincoln's provisional governors; now, speaking in praise of Johnson's, he gibed at the radical republicans in the house (an impolitic thing to do in the first place), calling Stevens, not inaptly, the "conscience-keeper of the majority."

Ay, there is the rub. What fat, unctuous, juicy pickings have been lost to the faithful by this cruel policy of the President! What shoals of loyal, hungry sharks, swimming around in these northern waters, have been created out of their anticipated prey.[31]

[28] *Congressional globe*, 37 congress, 3 session, 835.
[29] *Ibid.*, 39 congress, 1 session, 115.
[30] *Ibid.*, 39 congress, 1 session, 150 ff.
[31] *Ibid.*, 39 congress, 1 session, 152.

He states in concise metaphor the case for the president:

We are asked to ravel to pieces all that the President has done, and to commence the knitting process of reunion for ourselves. The healing principles of the Constitution are, in my judgment, rapidly doing the needed work of restoration, and yet we are at this stage of the process asked to break again the once fractured limbs, to tear agape the half-closed wounds, and to cause the whole land to bleed afresh. Sir, I shall stand by the physician who is working the cure as against that blind and fatal empiricism which first pronounces the patient dead and then commences giving medicine.[32]

In the same speech he defends the right of the southern states to representation in congress. His inconsistency seems clear. That his later attitude was the more statesmanlike cannot, unfortunately, be placed unequivocally to his credit, since his turn from hostility to support of the executive was in large part merely a change of front on the same ground, in order to face the greater danger from congress to his principles and sympathies. But it is worth while remarking that he was the first democrat to come out strongly and openly in defense of the presidential policy in the house, and he led his party in that path, harmful as this support was to the cause advocated. That there were limits to Voorhees' partisanship, and that his principles were his own as well as his party's, is indicated by the following extract on a bill to remove the political disabilities of a few Texans:

Mr. Speaker, I would not seek to participate in this debate were it not for some difference of opinion that prevails on this side of the House. I regard political proscription as wrong entirely. There is no part of it right in principle. . . Looking at the subject in that light, I cannot sympathize with those of my friends on this side of the House who object to this bill because it is partisan in character. . . I cannot recognize a man's political opinions at all in discussing the right to vote and hold office in this country. . . It matters not to me if every one named in this bill shall vote with the Republican party.[33]

Voorhees was never an officeholder nor a party manager, and his public career was exclusively congressional.[34] It may con-

[32] *Congressional globe*, 39 congress, 1 session, 151.

[33] *Ibid.*, 41 congress, 2 session, 3033.

[34] The only indication to the contrary that the writer has found is the statement that, in the democratic state convention of Indiana in 1858, "Voorhees wrote the

veniently be divided into two main subjects, not lacking connection, but tolerably distinct. The first of these, his attitude on the questions relating to civil war and reconstruction, has already been treated; the second, including mainly matter of a financial nature, remains. Before taking it up the events of Voorhees' life subsequent to 1865 may be briefly noted.

A member of the house of representatives in the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth congresses, his seat in the election of 1864 was contested by a Colonel Washburn. The committee on elections, as usual, was not very prompt in reporting, and Voorhees held his seat long enough elaborately to uphold his resolution in support of the president. In February, after a spirited debate and an able defense of Voorhees by Mr. Marshall of Illinois, the vote was taken which unseated him. He was not a candidate in 1866; but in 1868 and 1870 was again returned by his district. In 1872 he was defeated by the Greeley candidate, and for four years devoted himself to his law practice in Terre Haute. In 1877, Governor Williams appointed him to fill the unexpired term in the senate occasioned by the death of Oliver P. Morton. As a candidate for the senate before the people in 1878 he is declared to have carried the legislature by a popular majority of over thirty thousand, and on joint ballot by a majority of twenty-three against Benjamin Harrison, the rival candidate;[35] but the democrats had "committed grand larceny on the Greenback platform."[36] He was reëlected in 1884 and 1891 by "unparalleled" majorities, but in 1897, a few months before his death, was defeated by Charles W. Fairbanks. He died in Washington on April 10, 1897. The writer of his memoir remarks that "from his first nomination to Congress in 1856, he never, in any of the conventions in which his name was presented as a candidate for the house or senate, had opposition in his own party."[37] In the senate, Voorhees served on the committees on pensions and immigration, and continuously on the committee on finance, of which for a time he was chairman. He was influential in the building of the present Library of congress.

platform, artfully dodging all doubtful issues." Logan Esarey, *History of Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1918), 2: 653.

[35] Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory*, 1: 5.

[36] Esarey, *History of Indiana*, 2: 878.

[37] Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory*, 1: 5.

Voorhees, as has been gathered, was not notable for knowledge in any particular field; he was not a statesman, a legal authority, nor even a party leader. He was primarily an orator, who held such eminence as was granted him by his appeal to the people of his state and by his faithful and eloquent rendition of their sentiments. Nothing unusual, therefore, need be expected in his views on financial questions, and any history of American finance can give the setting and import of the policies that he advocated more properly than they could be indicated here. Four motives dominated his opinions, all closely interrelated and interplaying in various combinations according to the trend of a particular argument. The first of these was the sentiment for free trade on the ground that protection bears hardly on the farmer; the second the desire for a large and freely circulating currency, for plenty of money; the next the antagonism to and distrust of New England and the "money power" in general of all large industries and large creditors; and lastly the chronic objection of the agricultural middle west to being taxed for the benefit of others, an attitude which cropped out at every proposed measure which the farmers did not fully understand. These views, however, sustained some modification during his later senatorial career.

As early as March 10, 1862, Voorhees opposed strongly any project to tax the people of the free states in order to buy the slaves of the southerners.[38] Four weeks later he presented a resolution, which was immediately laid on the table, to the effect that the tariff system then in force was unjust and oppressive to the agricultural portions of the community: "All the advantages and wealth of the said system of tariff accrue to a privileged class of manufacturers and capitalists."[39] In the debate on an internal revenue bill appeared his sectional jealousy of New England. "Does the manufacturing interest pay anything to the support of the Government? Or does the agricultural interest pay it all?"[40] Such quotations might be continued indefinitely. It is hardly possible to find a speech during Voorhees' years in the lower house which does not somewhere touch on the unequal burdens which he sees in the revenue system of

[38] *Congressional globe*, 37 congress, 2 session, 1150.
[39] *Ibid.*, 37 congress, 2 session, 1563.
[40] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 304.

the republicans. In a very long set speech in 1870[41] Voorhees announced that he was appearing in the cause of the farmer and laboring man against the capitalist, "who toils not, neither does he spin." The argument is almost entirely a demand for the payment of United States bonds in currency (*i.e.* greenbacks) instead of in coin. The debt of the civil war was incurred at a time when the nation was in such straits that it was helpless against the money lenders.

> I here solemnly assert and shall prove that a vast proportion of the public debt as it is stated upon paper has no existence whatever in reality; that it is a fiction created by unjust and scandalous legislation . . . that it is a fraud fastened upon the labor of the nation utterly without consideration either legal or moral; that it is a sheer and naked extortion from the necessities, the wants, the helplessness of the people and the armies when they were wholly at the mercy of capital.[42]

The act of March 18, 1868, pledging coin in payment of all obligations of the government, was an object of much denunciation by Voorhees for many years after, as well as the "crime of 1873." In 1870, logically, he is found advocating an income tax.[43]

There is one speech, delivered in 1874 at Greencastle, Indiana, when he was not a candidate for any office,[44] which is an excellent example of Voorhees' oratory, as well as of the current arguments against specie payments. The *Chicago Times* is quoted as demanding the "destroy and burn" method of contracting the currency to a specie basis, on which text a most moving picture is drawn of the suffering of the people if this should be done. He quotes Thaddeus Stevens and John Sherman very convincingly in his support, and asks why they have changed their opinions. He is very fond of talking about the "gold gamblers' den" in New York, and fairly gloats over its horrors. In every case, it must be remembered, the objection to paying bondholders in specie when they paid only greenbacks is made under the express denial that such refusal would be repudiation. Money, he says, is the creature of the government, both as to quality and quantity. After Grant's veto of the republican bill

[41] *Congressional globe*, 41 congress, 2 session, 856 ff.
[42] *Ibid.*, 41 congress, 2 session, 857.
[43] *Ibid.*, 41 congress, 2 session, 2938.
[44] Voorhees, *Speeches*, 473.

to expand the currency, he says: "the organs of the bondholders' unlawful robbery, the agents of monopoly, have been singing a jubilee in his praise ever since. This is just. He is entitled to the approval and support of all those who think that the people ought to pay more than they owe, who demand a return to specie payments before our national debt is paid according to the laws under which it was created."

Voorhees' first speech in the senate was an appeal for the payment of bonds in currency, for free silver, for the bimetallic standard.[45] He believed our whole financial system to be "an organized crime against the laboring, tax-paying men and women of the United States" and he protested against the argument of good faith as a means of perpetuating abuses. Greenbacks were declared to be the best money that ever circulated on American soil. Voorhees tried to turn the name of repudiators against the republicans themselves, and said of the act of 1869 pledging gold payments that "in the whole financial history of the civilized world no parallel can be found to this audacious deed of broken faith, deliberate treachery to the people, and national dishonesty."[46] The demonetization of silver and the act for the resumption of specie payments have, he declares, meant a shrinkage in value of the property of the people of the United States of thirty-five per cent — a criminal confiscation. Voorhees demands essentially the same things as Allen and the protagonists of the "Ohio idea"; the program which he advocates constitutes, he says, a plea for the financial credit of the government. It consists of four items which state pretty comprehensively the desires of the mid-western democracy: the restoration of the silver dollar, the repeal of the resumption act, putting an end to the national banking system, and making greenbacks universal legal tender. Near the end of the speech is a piece of intuitional guesswork rather interesting in such a time and place: "All the widespread influences of capital are organized and combined. The holders of public securities in America and in Europe work together. They think and act in concert."[47]

The idea that the powerful industrial and banking groups of

[45] *Congressional record*, 7: 330 ff.
[46] *Ibid.*, 7: 331.
[47] *Ibid.*, 7: 338.

the east, parallel and similar to those of England, were ruling the country through the republican party, was, in fact, a dominant feature of Voorhees' whole attitude. Exception must, of course, frequently be taken to his expressions, but that his sense of the general trend was wrong can hardly be claimed. As the century advanced and his own community was gradually included within the spreading industrial area of the country, his position began to fluctuate. A minor note appears, that manufacturing industries are not all as wicked as they have been painted, and he even admits frankly to believing in a moderate degree of protection incidental to the procuring of revenue. Voorhees' value as an historical figure lies precisely in this fact, that he was a simple and straightforward nature, with a sound but entirely unsubtle or profound intelligence; he did not think so much as he felt, and the impress of events on him was accordingly direct and uninvolved. At the beginning of his career he represented a community still essentially western, agrarian, and allied in its sympathies more with the south than with the east. During a third of a century, the agricultural character of his state was changed, less by replacement than by a dilution with the industrial elements originally confined to more eastern regions. The result was to make Voorhees less extreme and sectional and more moderate; though he retained his early outlook he was unavoidably affected by new conditions.

In this light Voorhees' position on the various questions arising during his senatorial career may be explained. To the end he remained a staunch defender of the south, a standpoint which on many occasions could be assumed with an excellent grace by a defender of the traditional "rights of American citizens." In a speech of 1879 against laws permitting federal interference in elections he declares:

[They] emanate from that spirit which ruled over Venice, when a whisper or a look of suspicion was more to be dreaded than the blow of a dagger, and when the silent and voiceless accusation doomed its objects to walk the Bridge of Sighs into the caverns of a ruthless and lingering death. In English history there never was a period during which they could have been executed. Charles I lost his head, James II his throne, and George III his American colonies in attempting far less encroachments on the liberties of Englishmen than these laws perpetrate on the liber-

ties of Americans. . . Here at last we behold the citadel of free government stormed and taken.[48]

And he denies bluntly that "anything in the conduct or condition of the southern people requires such laws as now blacken the pages of our statutes. . . The issue thus joined is not sectional. It now concerns the personal liberty of the northern as much as it does the southern voter."[49]

Some years later, in the course of a partisan debate he queries with some pertinence:

The especial anger of the Republican leaders is excited because the vote of the South in a national contest is solid against their party. Will some one on the other side of the chamber, and with even the slightest knowledge of human nature, tell me how the vote of the South could be other than it is?[50]

Of a piece with his defense of the south, his advocacy of free silver and of the cause of the farmer on all occasions, was Voorhees' opposition to the national banks, which was frequently and emphatically expressed during his first term in the senate.[51] The system is called "vast and overshadowing" and the prediction is made that "sooner or later the people of this country, awake to their rights and tired of imposition, will rise against the fatal pretensions of the present system of national banks and . . . tear their charters to pieces."[52] The shades of Jackson and of the second United States bank are of course invoked in glowing terms; indeed the phrasing of the accusation of the system of Chase might well have come from the struggle with the earlier structure of 1830.

A very enlightening study is the evolution of Voorhees' position on the tariff. During the civil war, as has been seen, he opposed the tariff policy of the republicans. The issue did not again arise in acute form for nearly twenty years, and by 1882 a distinct change of tone is to be noted. "I speak not in support of a tariff for revenue only, nor of a tariff for protection only, but in support of a tariff which collects the necessary revenue and at the same time, to the extent of that revenue, extends protection, with discriminating justice, to American manufac-

[48] *Congressional record*, 9: 506.
[49] *Ibid.*, 9: 511.
[50] *Ibid.*, 19: 3326.
[51] *Ibid.*, 7: 337; 11: 1714; 13: 837, 5073.
[52] *Ibid.*, 13: 5076.

tories."[53] And he asks especially for protection for the industries of the south, ignoring or not realizing the degree to which protection was bound up with the dominant republicanism. Those familiar with the methods by which tariff changes have commonly been made will smile at the naïve yet eminently sensible view taken by the senator from Indiana:

There are over one thousand dutiable articles in our tariff list. . . I do not think it is wise, intelligent, legislation to make a horizontal scale over all articles. You cannot treat everything alike. Those articles that need more reduction than ten per cent. ought to have that reduction; those that ought to have less should be treated accordingly, and those that ought to have none ought to be left alone.[54]

Later, in an eloquent upholding of Cleveland's tariff message, he says:

I am one of those who believe there is no necessary antagonism between the agricultural and manufacturing industries of this country. I believe there is a safe, sound middle ground between the high protectionist per se on the one hand, and the wild freetrader and direct taxationist on the other; that the prosperity of this country lies where its growth and development, both of lands and manufactures, will be best promoted and protected.[55]

But a year afterwards he bursts out in a striking phrase on the old theme:

In the bitter, sectional times of the past the stinging taunt was often flung at the Northern Democracy that they were submissive to the South in public affairs, that they were dough-faces on the subject of slavery. With infinitely more of truth and justice that taunt can now be returned against the leaders of the Republican party and their servile obedience to every demand of tariff monopoly and protected trust. They are the dough-faces of a financial slavery as wrong in principle, and often more cruel and heartless in practice than any other form of human servitude ever known in our midst.[56]

The McKinley tariff aroused his full ire, voiced in a heart-racking picture of the desolation of the laboring and farming classes at the hands of a bloated plutocracy:[57]

[53] *Congressional record*, 13: 5996.
[54] *Ibid.*, 13: 6495.
[55] *Ibid.*, 19: 198.
[56] *Ibid.*, 20: 348.
[57] *Ibid.*, 21: 7531 ff.; also in Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory*, 1: 00.

Living under a plutocracy, the farmer does not own his full time and labor. . . . Under the iniquitous system by which the tariff taxes him upon every necessity of life he is compelled to devote the proceeds of at least two days out of the six to the protection and enrichment of the robber barons.[58]

When the turn of the democrats to get at the tariff came in 1894, Voorhees was the nominal manager for the Wilson bill on the floor of the senate, but owing to his ill health the major part of the work was done by Senator Harris of Tennessee. The leadership, remarks Taussig, was "lamentably unskilful." Voorhees' great effort for the democratic bill contains the partisan material to be expected. The McKinley law is again attacked with heavy batteries as being the cause of all the strikes, bankruptcies, and all other economic ills since 1890. There is a very long passage pointing with pride to the Walker tariff of 1846 as "standing out in its wisdom, its success, and its glory over all others," and a fervid peroration on the eternal principles of Jefferson. The democratic purpose, it is pointed out, is "to replace the law of 1890 with a measure of reform, safe, conservative, harmonious in itself, and to which all the wholesome and legitimate industries of the country will speedily adapt themselves and tenaciously cling for secure development and undisturbed growth in the future."[59] The language is already suspicious of the actual outcome of the matter, but it was a pity such an aim could not be accomplished. Certainly no politician could honestly believe that it would be. No uniform or consistent principle was followed, and the actual changes from the McKinley bill were of minute proportions when compared to democratic utterances.

Voorhees' time of greatest prominence in the public eye was during the famous extra session of 1893 on the repeal of the Sherman silver purchase act. In the last session of the fifty-second congress Voorhees said that he considered the Sherman law vicious in principle, but that if he voted for its repeal, it must be in connection with something better.[60] Perhaps the urgency of President Cleveland caused him to reconsider, for in the long and strenuous summer session in which a minority of

[58] *Congressional record*, 21: 2380.
[59] *Ibid.*, 26: 3391 ff.
[60] *Ibid.*, 24: 1754.

the senate signalized its power in a way long unforgiven by American publicists, it was Voorhees, as chairman of the committee on finance, who led the fight for repeal. The details of the struggle are unnecessary; Voorhees remained throughout a staunch defender of the administration, while denying that the repeal of the silver purchase clause meant the demonetization of silver.[61] That he made every effort to assert the maintenance of his traditional position on other subjects is indicated not only by subsequent history, but by the offhand manner in which such a periodical as the *Nation* dismissed his vote on the Sherman law as a "lucid interval with which he was mysteriously afflicted."[62] The event is, however, hardly so abnormal as to require one to follow the example of the *Nation* in explaining it. Voorhees voted for repeal because he saw that the effect of the law as it stood was bad, and because he felt, as he would not have felt ten or twelve years previously, that a sufficiently considerable part of his constituency would back him up in such action. It is worth noting that Voorheees steadily supported Cleveland on the various questions on which Cleveland's party gave trouble, though of old he had been a follower of Thurman far more than of Seymour or of Tilden.

Such westernism as that of Voorhees was already pretty remote from the frontier, as can be seen in his attitude on the Indian question, which tended strongly to the humanitarian and philanthropic.[63] In 1890 he thought it more important to feed the Indians properly than to supply the settlers with arms against them, since starvation was the real cause of hostility.[64] But he was a strong American, protesting often and loudly against imprisonment of American citizens by foreign nations, against an insult to a United States consul, and in general opposing any diplomacy which should smack of knuckling under to another power.[65] He would "be glad if the power of our flag and of our foreign policy could be asserted with far more spirit than it has been."[66] Yet he opposed all expansion of the navy on the

[61] *Congressional record*, 25: 2332.

[62] *Nation*, 57: 458.

[63] *Congressional globe*, 41 congress, 2 session, 1579, 1581, 1600; *Congressional record*, 10: 2631.

[64] *Ibid.*, 22: 45 ff., 68; see also *ibid.*, 23: 2985 ff.

[65] *Ibid.*, 13: 2886.

[66] *Ibid.*, 14: 1523.

ground chiefly of its expense to the people.[67] Such an inconsistency is characteristically American. In his early days Voorhees was a strong expansionist, with an eye southwards,[68] and he always spoke with enthusiasm of the achievements of the Mexican war; but the writer cannot find that he ever took any interest in the Cuban situation. He was, of course, included in the large class of those not averse to showing public distrust of England.

Voorhees was one of the strongest of the champions of liberal pensions, and was always ready to support the claims of the needy against the United States. He was frequently the sponsor of proposals to buy for the country memorials and portraits of famous people, collections of papers, works of art or pseudo-art dealing with historical subjects, and the like.

On the issue of civil service reform the position of Voorhees was partisan and uninteresting. He talked well, of course, but frankly opposed any reform which did not mean a radical attack on the tenure of office of republicans. He opposed political assessments of officeholders, which he asserted to be a peculiarly republican abuse,[69] and in a later congress he introduced a bill to prohibit officers and employees of the United States from contributing money for political purposes.[70] Beyond this his services to the cause are not in evidence. Obviously the matter did not interest him: Indiana had more important things to work for.

There is one question about Voorhees which is of academic rather than of true historic interest. Was he so far on the path of disloyalty in the civil war as to be affiliated with the Knights of the Golden Circle? The evidence is not conclusive, but it seems probable that he was. F. G. Stidger, the agent who was of chief use to the government in disclosing the organization and plans of the treasonable conspiracy in Kentucky and Indiana, records as follows: "In the course of conversation Harrison remarked to Dodd [Grand Commander for Indiana and the real head of the order in the whole country] that he did not consider it advisable to tell Mr. Voorhees too much of the secrets of the Order, somewhat cautioning Dodd against being very free with

[67] *Congressional record*, 15: 1495; 21: 5282.
[68] Voorhees, *Speeches*, 54 ff.
[69] *Congressional record*, 14: 139.
[70] *Ibid.*, 15: 1047.

the information he imparted to Voorhees."[71] The only other evidence against Voorhees is contained in a letter to him from General Carrington under date of August 16, 1864, stating the conditions under which certain papers bearing the ritual of the Order of American Knights had been found in rooms formerly occupied by Voorhees as a law office, and in which was still his furniture.[72] On many occasions Voorhees categorically denied all the charges (which had a habit of springing to life in partisan debates) in unambiguous terms, and alleged in his turn that someone had put the copies of the ritual in his room while he was in Washington, in order to excite feeling against him in the midst of a spirited political contest.[73] Lincoln evidently considered Voorhees as definitely disaffected, for in a letter of September 8, 1864, he remarked that Voorhees and Vallandigham were arming the people of the northwest.[74] At any event, all that can be certainly predicated of the matter is that Voorhees was not active in the councils of the disloyalists; that he was sounded by them and did not feel obliged to divulge such information as came to his ears, seems more than probable.

Voorhees' prominence, as has been said, was due in the main to his oratorical powers, and he was very widely known as a jury pleader in criminal cases. His knowledge of the law was neither broad, nor deep, nor even accurate. "Others gathered the evidence and planned the fight; he made the speech."[75] McCulloch says of him that he "could speak eloquently before he could speak correctly."[76] In college he was already noted as as orator.[77] One of his most famous cases was the defense of John E. Cook, mentioned above, which brought him national

[71] Felix G. Stidger, *Treason history of the Order of Sons of liberty, formerly Circle of Honor, succeeded by Knights of the Golden Circle, afterward Order of American Knights. The most gigantic treasonable conspiracy the world has ever known* (Chicago, 1903), 100.

[72] *Ibid.*, 137 ff.; also printed in William D. Foulke, *Life of Oliver P. Morton, including his important speeches* (Indianapolis, 1899), 1: 391 ff.

[73] *Congressional globe*, 39 congress, 1 session, 917; 41 congress, 2 session, 1485.

[74] Ida M. Tarbell, *Life of Abraham Lincoln, drawn from original sources and containing many speeches, letters, and telegrams hitherto unpublished, and illustrated with many reproductions from original paintings, photographs, etc.* (New York, 1909), 3: 203.

[75] Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 364.

[76] Hugh McCulloch, *Men and measures of half a century; sketches and comments* (New York, 1900), 74.

[77] Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 356.

fame.[78] John Brown was convicted of treason and murder, but Cook of murder alone, due to Voorhees' plea. W. W. Thornton, writing in a serious if not weighty legal periodical, says of him: "In the whole range of forensic oratory there is not a more eloquent and forcible appeal to a jury for lenience than Voorhees made."[79] Other successful jury arguments (Voorhees always made the closing address) are the defense of Mary Harris for murder—"perhaps his greatest speech";[80] the defense of Harry Crawford Black for killing the seducer of his sister;[81] the defense of Edward T. Johnson for the murder of the seducer of his wife;[82] and the case of Hallett Kilbourne against the sergeant-at-arms of the house of representatives for false imprisonment. The verdict in this case was twice set aside as awarding excessive damages,[83] on the first of which occasions the judge remarked:

I think we can trace the influence upon the minds of the jury largely to the powerful appeal addressed to them in the argument of the counsel who closed the case on the part of the plaintiff. They were evidently moved by his eloquence and inspired by the magnanimity of his sentiments so that they overlooked the more sober and impassive instructions of the law.[84]

Finally may be given the statement, remarkable if true, that in 1873 the law of Indiana allowing the defendant the closing argument in criminal cases was changed and that privilege given to the prosecution, "and this was brought about almost wholly because of the many triumphs of Voorhees."[85]

Enough has been said to indicate the field of Voorhees' glory and the great success which he there enjoyed. His expression was flowery and often exaggerated, copious but not verbose. Certainly it has a good American flavor and brings to our lips sometimes the smile which most manifestations of the Victorian

[78] Carlton, in his biographical sketch in Voorhees, *Speeches*, says that even as late as 1875 Voorhees was in receipt of frequent requests for copies of this speech.

[79] Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 357.

[80] *Ibid.*, 14: 358.

[81] Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory*, 2: 598.

[82] *Ibid.*, 2: 449.

[83] Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 361.

[84] Voorhees, *Forty years of oratory*, 2: 508.

[85] Thornton, "Daniel W. Voorhees as lawyer and orator," in *Green bag*, 14: 363; Meredith Nicholson, *The Hoosiers* (New York, 1900), 15.

age now evoke, but the writer cannot agree with such half-sneering remarks as those made by a sophisticated reviewer in the *Nation*.[86] Voorhees had the essentials of real eloquence. His presence was magnetic and imposing, winning for him the sobriquet of "Tall Sycamore of the Wabash." Not a maker of easily quotable phrases, he had nevertheless smoothness of diction and picturesqueness of image, while he delivered in an exceedingly melodious and ringing voice that could be heard distinctly in the largest assembly.[87] McCulloch declares that "upon the stump Voorhees had few equals and no superiors,"[88] while a more recent writer has called him the greatest forensic orator of his day in the Ohio valley.[89] Even one who now looks on Voorhees' speeches on dead issues must be struck with their readability and with the attraction of a simple and earnest personality.

Henry D. Jordan

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

[86] *Nation*, 66: 365.

[87] McCulloch, *Men and measures of half a century*, 74. This paragraph conveys exactly the same picture as that conveyed in the longer article of Thornton.

[88] *Ibid.*

[89] Nicholson, *The Hoosiers*, 15.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

Bleeding Kansas and the Pottawatomie Murders

Disagreeing in most things else, friendly and hostile critics of John Brown unite in regarding the Pottawatomie creek murders of May 24, 1856, as the crucial act in his career.[1] But in their interpretation of the bearing of this event upon the character of Brown friendly biographers differ from hostile critics as midnight darkness from the noonday sun.[2] Although the affair has been much written about, students of Brown and of "Bleeding Kansas" will doubtless welcome, even now, additional contemporary evidence concerning it. Edward P. Bridgman, author of the letter here presented, grew to manhood at Northampton, Massachusetts, whence in 1856, a youth of twenty-two, he set out for Kansas. His arrival there and the circumstances which thrust him at once into the midst of some of the most exciting events which earned for contemporary Kansas its gory descriptive appellation are described in the letter itself. A few months after the sack of Lawrence, the proslavery men attacked Osawatomie, and Bridgman was one of the little band with which Brown fought his most notable battle. Some months later he returned to Massachusetts; he served through the civil war in the Thirty-seventh Massachusetts infantry, and in the early seventies migrated to northern Wisconsin. From 1901 until his death in the summer of 1915 Mr. Bridgman resided in Madison. Although an educated man and one of the last survivors of the battle of Osawatomie, historians of "Bleeding Kansas" and biographers of Brown seem never to have consulted Mr. Bridgman; their ignorance of him and the valuable evidence he might have supplied was probably due to his early removal from the territory and his subsequent pioneer life on another frontier (he was one of the first settlers of northern Wisconsin).

M. M. Quaife

[1] For an interesting discussion of this point see the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 1: 320 ff.

[2] See *ibid.* for a convenient summary of the opposing views of Villard and Hill P. Wilson.

Kansas May 25, 1856.

Dear Cousin Sidney [3]

* * *

I write now to let you know my present situation & a little about the affairs of Kansas 1st I will give you a sketch of my trip from Kansas City to Osawatomie, where I am located 10th of May arrived at Kansas City, a place perhaps of 3,000. at first appearance from the river it is an uninteresting looking town, the principal st. is on the river back of which is a large hill or bluff, which hides the largest portion of the town. it is [a] very pleasant place a mile or so back of the river, the ground is rolling with many beautiful groves & fine locations for residences here I met with a company of 5 young men from Ill. who were going to look themselves out homes in Kansas. I thought I could do no better than to join them & did so Sat. noon the next day we left the City for the Territory; The first 6 or 8 miles were very rough & hilly. After that we came on to gentle rolling prairie We met 2 men on horseback who remarked "You are going into a glorious country" & we found it so in the fullest sense of the word Sat. night we pitched our tent & remained until Monday morning. we passed the Shawne Mission around which were many beautiful & well cultivated farms owned by the Indians. Monday night we came to Ball Creek. next night found us in Prairie City — a little village of 7 log huts. from there we proceeded to Osawatomie, where I stoped the rest went on to the Neosho country. here I met with Cornelius Kowlen. he has a good timber claim that he values at $1500.

Osawatomie is a very pritty place, 50 miles from Kansas City, the same distance from Lawrence, the three towns form a triangle — at equal distance from each other. Osawatomie derives its name from the two rivers on either side of it — Osage & Potawatomie. I have a good claim 2½ miles from the town of Prairie. There is but little timber in the territory but that is taken, except on Indian reserve lands. The land around O. is beautiful. I never saw a place I liked so well. As far as the eye can reach nothing to be seen but one vast rolling prairie, with here and there a bluff, or as we call them at the East, hills; then on the rivers, as far as one can see is any quantity of timber, principally oak & black walnut. What I have seen of Kansas is all it is cracked up to be, as regards the scenery and beauty of landscape. I must say I am glad I have come to Kansas tho I have many inconveniences to put up with which I expected to meet with. The pioneer has many hardships to undergo, yet if he lives long enough he will outlive them. But let me give you a little account of the excitement which never was before so great in Kansas. In some small towns the men are called up nearly

[3] The sentences omitted concern trivial personal matters.

every night to hold themselves in readiness to meet the worst. as scouting parties of Alabamians Georgians & Missourians are around continually, plundering clothes yards[?], horses & cattle, & everything they can lay hold of. A few miles from Lawrence a man was plowing. a party of Southerners came along and being hungry killed his best ox, ate what they wanted, took away some & left the rest. Such like occurrences are almost daily taking place. Last Thursday, news came from Lawrence that she was in the hands of the Ruffans, & that they had demolished the free state Hotel, burned Robinson's house, & destroyed the two printing presses. Almost immediately a company of 30 was raised. There was no reason why I could not go for one, so I borrowed a rifle & ammunition & joined them.[4] The thought of engaging in a battle is not a pleasing one, but the free state men are compelled to. Why should I not do [so] as well as others, I have nothing to hinder me & my life is no dearer to me than the lives of others are to them. At sundown we started, traveled till midnight, rode some & marched some. We were divided into 2 divisions & took turns in walking. It was really affecting to see husbands & wives bid each other good bye. — not knowing as they would ever see each other again. yet the feelings & sympathies of the women are as much enlisted in the cause as the men. It is nothing uncommon to see them running bullets & making catriges. One woman yesterday told me that she had often been called up nights to make them, but to proceed with our march

At 2½ o'clock Friday morning we started again went as far as a place called Tawa Jones[5] where we halted for breakfast & a short respit; At 4 o'clock we arrived at Prairie City, where we found the Prairie company ready to receive us here we camped till 12 o'clock at night when we started for Palmyra[6] on the Santa fe road, 12 or 14 miles south of Lawrence, Here we now are, arrived here at 3 o'clock; dont know when we shall leave as a few men have gone to Lawrence to get further orders We heard last night that Robinson was in the hands of the enemy at Ball Creek, 15 miles east of here. We are drilled every day by Captain Dayton of Osawatomie. I will wait till I get to Lawrence before I finish the rest.

Tuesday, 27.

Since I wrote the above the Osawatomie company has returned to O. as news came that we could do nothing immediately, so we returned back.

[4] This was Captain Oscar V. Dayton's company of Osawatomie.

[5] This was John T. Jones, familiarly known as "Ottawa." Jones was an Indian who had married a New England woman. They were friendly to the free state cause and befriended Brown at different times; because of this their home was destroyed by the border ruffians on the day of the battle of Osawatomie.

[6] Now Baldwin, Kansas.

On our way back we heard that 5 men had been killed by Free State men. the men were butchered — ears cut off & the bodies thrown into the river the murdered men (Proslavery) had thrown out threats & insults, yet the act was barbarous & inhuman whoever committed by we met the men going when we were going up & knew that they were on a secret expedition, yet didn't know what it was. Tomorrow something will be done to arrest them. there were 8 concerned in the act. perhaps they had good motives, some think they had, how that is I dont know. The affairs took place 8 miles from Osawatomie. The War seems to have commenced in real earnest. horses are stolen on all sides whenever they can be taken. I saw a young man who was at Lawrence at the time of the siege, a ruffan came up to him and demanded his Sharp's rifle & revolver. said he, "I haven't a rifle, & my revolver I bought and paid [for] & you can't have it." "We'll see, you G— d——d son of a b——h" (a very familiar phrase with them) "whether I'll have it or not," at the same time calling 5 or 6 of his men to him, they put their bayonets to his breast & thus forced him to give it up & [then?] demanded his money. nearly every house was broke open & plundered of its contents. threats have been made that they will destroy Osawatomie. General Robinson is taken prisoner at Westport. he requests his friends to do nothing in rescuing him, as it will be sure death to him. Gen. Pomeroy [7] I understand has gone East. Sidney I have a proposition to make perhaps its asking to much but its this. ask friends in Northampton to send me a Sharps rifle & send it out by Mr. Pomeroy or someone coming out in [if] there should be such an opportunity I cant afford to get one myself but I do wish I had one very much: think it over awhile before saying no. I will finish the rest of this tomorrow evening.

Weds eve.

Since yesterday I have learned that those men who committed those murders were a party of Browns. one of them was formerly in the wool business in Springfield, John Brown his son, (Jn) has been taken today, tho he had no hand in the act, but was knowing to it, but when I write to Maria I will give further particulars Osawatomie is in much fear & excitement News came tonight that a co. of Georgians and Alibamians were coming to make this their headquarters. All work is nearly suspended, the women are in constant fear It was really pleasing to witness the reception of our co. by the women after they came in to O. it was a little after dark. A long line of women and children stood by the roadside to greet us & joy was depicted on every countenance. hands were heartily shaken and congratulations offered but I must close.[8]

[7] Samuel C. Pomeroy, United States senator from Kansas, 1861-1873.

[8] The sentences omitted concern trivial personal details.

* * * Please direct in care of C H Crane Osawatomie. I fear this will not reach you on account of the war[?].

Yours truly, E

It wont be best for me to write my name so you must guess who wrote this but very few now attach their full name to a letter

An Unknown Expedition to Santa Fe in 1807

That James, or Jacques,[1] Clamorgan played an important part in the early history of the trans-Mississippi west is generally recognized by students of the westward movement. But that he made an expedition from St. Louis to Santa Fe in the very year in which Pike returned from his famous expedition into the southwest is not so well known even to specialists. The following document, published now for the first time, indicates that Clamorgan and four companions with four mule-loads of merchandise made their way to Santa Fe in the fall of 1807 and that on December 12 they went on to Chihuahua to report to the commandant general.

I have found but two other references to Clamorgan's expedition, both of which are evidently inaccurate. Thomas James, writing in 1846, says: "Clem Morgan, a Portuguese and very wealthy, made his way thither [*i.e.* to Santa Fe] at a very early day, while Louisiana belonged to Spain, and returned in safety, making a good venture."[2] Although James had apparently received his information from hearsay, his statement is perhaps a fairly accurate account of the general features of the event except for its date. The other reference is by Walter B. Douglas, in his "Biographical sketch of Jacques Clamorgan." In it he says, "In 1807 he [Clamorgan] and Manuel Lisa sent a barge load of goods to New Mexico with a party commanded by Louison Baudoin."[3] Douglas was evidently not acquainted with the fact that Clamorgan himself accompanied the expedition, and since he does not indicate the source of his information it is impossible to check accounts on other points.

The original of the document, the draft of a letter from Joa-

[1] I have seen both forms of the name used in a single document, for example, in the title papers of the Clamorgan grant of 1837 (New York).

[2] Thomas James, *Three years among the Indians and Mexicans*, edited by Walter B. Douglas (St. Louis, 1916), 96.

[3] *Ibid.*, 214.

chin del Real Alencaster, governor of New Mexico, to the commandant at San Eleceario, is in the Spanish archives of New Mexico, now located in the Library of congress.[4] A photographic copy is in the Bancroft library, Berkeley, California, and it is from this that the document is now being published.

JOSEPH J. HILL

Text

El carabinero Josef Salaises sale de esta Provincia para ese pres.° con direccion a Chih.ª conduciendo al comerciante Frances de S. Luis en la Luisiana D. Santiago Clamorgan y otros tres que le acompañan y un esclabo con quatro cargas de generos correspondientes al espresado comerciante para presentarse con todo al Sor. Comand.te Gral, y es interesante al Real Serv.° le sirbe Vm. franquear al espresado Carabinero igual num.° de Bestias mulas que llevan los espresados Franceses y la partida de Pananas que pasa a dha villa á presentarse tambien, disponiendo queden en ese presidio las Bestias de este, para que las reciba el espresado Salaises a su retirada y se encargue de su conduccion.

El citado carabinero deve salir de ese presidio con solo un soldado, y el numero de ellos que Vm. le sirba franquearle para completar la Escolta, pues los 21 vecinos y 4 Yndios deven regresar immediatamente á esta Provincia con los dos soldados, siempre que no tenga Vm. orden que á ello se oponga en el concepto de que la detencion les seria sumamente gravosa, lo que espero tenga Vm. en consideracion.

Los espresados dos soldados, vecinos e Yndios van aviados de todo para regresar sin demora.

El citado Comandante lleva estrecha orden sobre la custodia de los tercios de generos y entregado formalm.te por imbentario formal de lo que cada uno contiene, con prohivicion absoluta de que sean abiertos ni reconocidos hasta verificar formal entrega segun disponga el Señor Comandante Gral, por lo que espero le sirbe Vm. franquearle en donde existan con toda seguridad los espresados tercios el corto tiempo que podran estar en ese Pres.° por ser conbeniente al R.l Serv.e

Dios etc. Santa Fee 12 de Dic.e de 1807

S.or Com.te de San Eleceario

Translation

The carabineer, Joseph Salaises, is leaving this province for that presidio on the way to Chihuahua, conducting the French merchant

[4] The document is listed in Ralph E. Twitchell, *Spanish archives of New Mexico, compiled and chronologically arranged with historical, genealogical, geographical and other annotations, by authority of the state of New Mexico* (Cedar Rapids, 1914), 2: 518.

from St. Louis in Louisiana, Mr. Santiago Clamorgan, and three others who are in his company, and one slave, with four loads of goods belonging to the said merchant, so that they may present themselves with everything before the *Comandante General*; and it is to the interest of the royal service that your grace should be pleased to issue to this carabineer a sufficient number of mules to carry these Frenchmen and the party of Pananas who are going to that *villa* to present themselves also, arranging that the mules from this presidio shall remain at that presidio, so that the said Salaises may receive them on his return and take charge of their conduction.

The carabineer mentioned must leave that presidio with only one soldier, and as many of them as your grace may be pleased to grant him to complete the escort, for the 21 citizens and 4 Indians must return immediately to this province with the two soldiers, provided that your grace has no order to the contrary, as it is believed that delay would be highly prejudicial to them, which I hope your grace will take into consideration.

The two soldiers mentioned, and the citizens and Indians, are going provided with everything, in order to be able to make the return without any delay.

The said *comandante* carries strict orders in regard to the care of the bales of goods and has been regularly informed, by a proper inventory, of the contents of each one, with absolute prohibition against their being opened or examined until they have been formally delivered, as may be ordered by the *Comandante General.* For this reason I hope that your grace will be pleased to grant him the use of a place where these bales of goods may remain in security for the short time that they may be in that presidio, this being necessary for the royal service.

May God etc. Santa Fe, December 12, 1807.

Señor Comandante of San Eleceario.

BOOK REVIEWS

The problem of the Pacific. By C. Brunsdon Fletcher. Preface by the Right Hon. Sir William MacGregor, P.C., G.C.M.G., C.B., etc. (New York: Henry Holt and company, 1919. 254 p. $3.00 net)

This volume, written within the shadow of the war — the preface is dated May, 1918 — and in contemplation of the peace conference, is nevertheless of much value as a handbook for the general public with regard to Pacific ocean problems, especially from the standpoint of Australasia. The author, born in England and having grown to manhood in New Zealand, has for some twenty years been engaged in journalism in Australia. Through relationship with the famous British missionary of the South seas, the Reverend George Brown, he has also had occasion to gain an unusually intimate understanding of the numerous island groups below the equator.

Much of his story has already appeared in his *The new Pacific*, published in 1917. The present work, however, is less obviously a war book than the other, and it reaches out to include the entire Pacific area (viewed by the author as a hemisphere), instead of restricting itself to Australasian waters. Nevertheless, the principal interest concerns Australia with respect to Pacific problems; indeed, China gets but little mention, and Hispanic America virtually none at all. The thesis seems to be that Germany can not be trusted with the possession of her former colonies. The obvious conclusion reached is — to quote the words of Sir William MacGregor, who has written a preface — that "Whatever form of administration may be adopted there are British officers there fit to carry it out."

It would be unfair, however, to characterize this volume as an out-and-out bit of British imperialistic propaganda. The author seems to wish that it were not necessary for Australia or Great Britain to gather in more territory. He rejoices at the presence of the United States in the Pacific, commenting upon its great services. He also speaks favorably of Japan, but displays a lingering feeling that the Japanese may have imbibed too freely of Prussian doctrine. Germany is revealed as an archplotter. The British empire is treated as a great pacificator, ever as mindful of the native as of the British subject. Far from being grasping, it is depicted as unduly yielding before the importunities of other powers. Some of the most interesting chapters deal with the internal problems of Australia itself, and they show clearly that the course of empire for the great southern continent will not be easy.

This work, while purporting to be a history, is rather a discussion of the present and future in the light of the somewhat heterogeneously assembled facts of the past. The volume is packed with information, and the story is entertainingly told.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN

Rise of the Spanish empire in the old world and in the new. Volume I, *The middle ages*; volume II, *The Catholic kings.* By Roger Bigslow Merriman, professor of history in Harvard university. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 529, 387 p. $7.50)

In the preface to the first volume Mr. Merriman informs the reader that the original plan of his work was formed several years ago in accordance with a scheme of lectures at Harvard university, a plan which, in its main features, has never been altered. Rightly does he declare that the history of Spain has not been considered "from the standpoint of the great Empire which sprang from her." His plan was evidently to compose a history of Spain to the death of Philip II, which would devote considerable attention to the establishment of its colonial empire in America. The volumes which are here reviewed constitute that part of the projected work describing the rise of the Spanish empire to the death of Philip I.

After an introduction which sketches ancient and early medieval Spanish history, Mr. Merriman begins his detailed study of Spain with his story of the reconquest of that country from the Mohammedans which, according to tradition, began at the cave of Covadonga. He devotes considerable space to the customs and institutions of Castile and Aragon and to the extension of Spanish influence over regions outside the Iberian peninsula. With a different emphasis, this volume treats many complicated topics that are lucidly described in volumes two and three of Altamira's *Historia de España y de la civilizacion Española.*

Merriman's second volume is a well-considered presentation of the age of Ferdinand and Isabella. The characters of those two monarchs, their accession to power, and the significance of their marriage are interestingly discussed. The last crusade against the Moorish kingdom of Granada — an effort which "evoked all that was best in the character of the Spaniard"— is described in some detail. The subjugation of the rebellious nobles, the rehabilitation of the royal finances, and the reorganization of the administrative system which followed the conquest of Granada are emphasized. But certain topics which have been exhaustively treated by Henry C. Lea, such as the "expulsion" of the Jews and the Moors, are treated with comparative brevity, important though they may seem in their relation to Spanish colonization in America. The

rôle of the reorganized royal council, the activity of the *cortes,* the financial reorganization of Spain, the Castilian *mesta,* the remodeling of Castilian municipal government, the use of the *corregidores* as royal instruments, the dominance of the crown over the clergy — these and similar measures that promoted national unification are admirably handled. A section, or "book," in this volume deals with the expansion of Spain. But only one chapter of that section, containing less than fifty pages, is directly concerned with the Indies. Into that small compass there is compressed the story of the discovery and early colonization of America, as well as an account of the origins of the Spanish colonial system.

These handsome volumes contain some useful maps, besides genealogical tables. One of the maps represents the Iberian kingdoms from 1250 to 1450, while another shows the Indies and the routes of the principal explorers to 1516. To the regret of the reviewer, the volumes do not contain a systematic bibliography. They are, however, equipped with footnotes throughout, and are interspersed with bibliographical notes, somewhat after the fashion of Channing's *History of the United States.*

Although at some points this work is supported by secondary authorities, yet it is the product of painstaking scholarship and is based mainly upon sources. The reviewer's chief criticism is that although Mr. Merriman has described in ample detail the rise of the Spanish empire in the old world, yet he has not presented in sufficient detail those conditions and institutions which were most intimately concerned with the fortunes of Spain's empire in the new world. Evidently this emphasis is in part due to the plan of these two volumes which describe the Spanish empire before 1516. In the first half of a work to be devoted to the rise of the Spanish power the standpoint of the author has been rather that of the European empire that sprang from Spain than that of the American empire.

Nevertheless, the volumes constitute the most important contribution which has been made in English to the literature of Spanish history since William Hickling Prescott depicted in inimitable phrases the romantic careers of the *conquistadores* in Mexico and Peru.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON

Self-government in the Philippines. By Maximo M. Kalaw, chief of the department of political science, University of the Philippines, secretary of the Philippine mission to the United States. (New York: Century company, 1919. 210 p. $1.50)

In this volume Mr. Kalaw presents a record of the accomplishments of the Filipino people since the passage of the Philippine autonomy act

of 1916, as proof that they have set up a stable government and are now ready for independence.

In view of the fact that the book is intended primarily for an American audience, it is unfortunate that the author finds it necessary to refer at length to "the rather unpleasant past." The volume gains little by its rehearsal of past errors and of disputes between the assembly and the commission, or by charges of ignorance and bad faith on the part of American officials. After reading many pages of this sort it is refreshing to find one page devoted to an appreciation of the work carried on by those who were responsible for the acquisition of the Philippines. They are credited with the policy of extending governmental powers, step by step; of opening schools, inaugurating public improvements, of allowing freedom of speech and press, all with the sole idea of the welfare and development of the Filipino people.

When, finally, Mr. Kalaw takes up his announced subject, he presents a strong argument as to the ability of the Filipino to govern himself. He tells us that under the new régime $15,000,000 has been appropriated for free education, and plans have been laid whereby every child of school age will be given the advantage of instruction. The immediate result of this action has been an increased attendance in the schools of nearly fifty per cent. Road building and other public works have been pushed with renewed vigor. In 1919 the appropriation for such purposes exceeded, by nearly five times, that of any year prior to 1916, and similar results have been obtained for the departments of health and agriculture. A Philippine national bank has been established to stimulate Filipino industries, while foreign capital has been given every inducement to extend old enterprises and to introduce new. The success of this bank is indicated by the increase of its resources from $10,000,000 in 1916 to $115,000,000 in 1918. Business has prospered and Philippine trade has nearly doubled in three years. Settlers have been encouraged to take up homesteads, even to the extent of supplying them with capital and work animals.

A policy of nationalizing and controlling such industries as the public welfare demanded has been successfully carried on. Most conspicious among these has been the management of the Manila railway, at a net profit of $1,000,000 over that obtained under private control.

The progress and extension of self-government is traced, also the steps taken to promote friendly relations with the pagan and Mohammedan peoples. Old animosities are being removed, artificial barriers swept away, and the Filipino population is rapidly being merged into a single people, united by a strong tie of nationality.

Two chapters are devoted to the organization of the new government and the adoption of a budget system. The latter is of special interest

at this time for it has resulted in economies which have turned former yearly deficits into a surplus of $17,000,000 at the end of 1918.

The recital of the devotion of the Filipinos to the cause of the allies during the war, their oversubscription to all bond issues and Red cross quotas; their offer of troops and appropriation of funds for two war vessels to be placed at the disposal of America, all make pleasant reading and give weight to the claim that "No better material can be found in Asia for the development of a democratic state than the Philippines."

FAY-COOPER COLE

Tabular views of universal history. A series of chronological tables, presenting, in parallel columns, a record of the more noteworthy events in the history of the world from the earliest times down to the present day, together with an alphabetical index of subjects. Compiled by George Palmer Putnam, A.M., and continued to date under the editorial supervision of George Haven Putnam, Litt.D. (New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1919. 520 p. $2.50)

This handbook of historical dates is a new revision of a work which has had a long career of usefulness; according to the publisher's preface, it may be said to have originated in 1832, when the idea of tabulating historical events so as to present on the same page contemporaneous developments in different countries was first worked out by Mr. G. P. Putnam, father of the editor of the present edition. The publication has been modernized by bringing events down to almost the very day the book went to press. In the regular section of "Tabular views of universal history" world events are outlined to November 12, 1918; then is added a section of fifty pages devoted to a special chronology of the great war, from July, 1914, to the signing of the armistice in November, 1918; finally, a brief supplementary table indicates the course of events during the period of the armistice, concluding with a succinct analysis of the terms of the peace treaty with Germany. Besides furnishing this obviously convenient chronology of events, the new edition justifies itself by a revision of some former entries, by the addition of genealogical tables of the principal families which have ruled in western Europe, and by an amplified index. By the use of excellent paper and clear print, the publisher has managed to compress this mine of information into a very neat and comfortable-sized volume, a fact which greatly enhances its attraction as a time-saving reference device.

L. W. T.

Introduction to the study of the government of modern states. By W. F. Willoughby, professor of jurisprudence and politics, Princeton university. (New York: Century company, 1919. 455 p. $2.25)

In this age of passion for detail, it is refreshing to hear a man who has a knowledge of politics at once academic and practical insist that students can comprehend particular political systems only when the fundamental principles of political philosophy have been mastered. "The great issues have been, and are, not over the details of governmental organization and modes of action, but over political principles. No amount of study of the mere details of governmental structure and operation will enable students to think intelligently regarding these issues."

And so Mr. Willoughby has given us another *Elements of political science.* There is not much that is new. For the most part he expounds the stereotyped theory of American political scientists. But it is a remarkably simple and clarified exposition, which excludes the irrelevant and compresses the essentials into easily-apprehended statements. He is not merely expository in method, however; his spirit is analytic, zetetic, he seeks to reach useful conclusions as to the better or worse of two possibilities. So, for example, he condemns a multiple (federal) form of government; he advocates that the central government (if a multiple system needs must be) should have the residuary powers; he would divide the United States into political districts, similar to those used by the census bureau; he discusses at length the respective merits of democracy and autocracy; he declares in favor of a unicameral legislature, and concludes that it should be only advisory or consultative — even if legislative power be given to a bicameral legislature, probably the upper house should have only advisory powers.

Especially good is his treatment of the constitution-amending process, of the domain of individual liberty, of the judiciary, and of the distribution of powers, territorially and functionally. In this last particular he abandons the traditional trichotomy, adding the administrative department and the electorate. The difference between executive and administrative powers is emphasized throughout.

Expository brevity has been secured only by omitting some things of which the loss will be felt in the college classroom. Little attention is given to the historical development of political theory; for example, the social contract theory is barely mentioned. There are very few references to other writers, ancient or modern, and practically no supplementary reading is suggested.

A. R. Ellingwood

Authority in the modern state. By Harold J. Laski, sometime exhibitioner of New college, Oxford. (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 398 p. $3.00)

In this notable contribution to the modern philosophy of the state, Mr. Laski carries on, with his usual erudition and with considerable success, the fascinating search for the explanation of political phenomena begun in his *Studies in the problem of sovereignty.* He propounds for inquiry two far-reaching questions: (1) Why does the individual yield political obedience? (2) How should authority be organized so as best to effect the purpose of the state? Rejecting the contract theory, he still admits that consent is an important element in obedience. That is, governmental acts must meet with the approval of the individual conscience. It follows that the individual has certain rights (among them freedom of thought) which must be secure against state invasion, and that the "last word" to the individual is the voice of duty. This leads to a pluralistic view of the state and a pragmatic attitude toward state acts. There results a decentralized federalism of responsible, autonomous groups, which do not depend upon law but have an inherent right to their existence, and in which the bond of association is the performance of a common function. This is true democracy. Only *right* is sovereign.

In four detailed studies, the writer shows how French political philosophy and practice in the nineteenth century support the conclusions he has set forth. The theocratic traditionalism of Bonald, based on unity and authority, convicted itself by its inadequacy. Lamennais, by dint of hard thinking, substituted for an intolerant philosophy of unity and order a tolerant liberalism based on division of power, liberty of conscience, and a democratic conception of the state. Royer-Collard opposed to political traditionalism his theory of the decentralized, multicellular state, in which personality is free to develop. Finally there has been in the French civil service the development of a group consciousness and a desire for functional decentralization, with group autonomy and responsibility.

Mr. Laski has promised a book on the theory of the state that will be eagerly awaited. Doubtless no one knows better than he that he has left many important questions unanswered. One may hope, too, that further wrestling with the formulation of the political principles underlying the modern state will result in a greater lucidity. I think it was a contemporary of Lamennais, who said, "On ne peut se flatter d'avoir le dernier mot d'une théorie tant qu'on ne peut pas l'expliquer en peu de paroles á un passant dans la rue." It is to be regretted, also, that the present book is marred by numerous typographical errors.

A. R. E.

Government organization in war time and after. A survey of the federal civil agencies created for the prosecution of the war. By William Franklin Willoughby. With an introduction by Frederick P. Keppel. [Problems of war and of reconstruction. Edited by Francis G. Wickware] (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1919. 370 p. $2.50 net)

Mr. Willoughby's book will make a wide and serious appeal. Though brief, it covers a large and important series of subjects. The organization of our government during the great war had many reaches and results. Its public documents were numerous and voluminous. Much was said of it by word of mouth and by the newspapers. The undertaking was so vast that the average citizen has failed to have anything like a clear perspective of it.

In the reviewer's opinion, Mr. Willoughby has rendered a valuable and important service. He has put in brief compass the really vital things in a vast governmental undertaking, or rather series of undertakings. He has given numerous quotations from laws, executive orders, reports, and other documents. He has stated the problem in each field of governmental effort and has described its conditions; he has told how the government proceeded to meet these conditions and how these conditions stood at the close of the war.

The general administration necessary for such governmental efforts, mobilization of our various forces — science, publicity agencies, finance, industry, foreign trade, shipping, inland transportation and communication, labor and labor conditions and administration, food, fuel, aircraft construction, and war risk insurance — each series of efforts has been portrayed with sufficient clearness.

One may not always agree with some of the author's analyses, opinions, and criticisms, but one is compellled to think that he has made a fair statement of each problem and of its conditions and the efforts for its solution. While his statement is brief, it is on the whole adequate for the purposes of the book. Mr. Willoughby has made a book which the average man can read and has the time to read. It is not voluminous, yet for all but the restricted specialist it is adequate.

CHARLES L. RAPER

Government and the war. By Spenser Wilkinson. (New York: Robert M. McBride and company, 1918. 268 p.)

This volume is composed for the most part of some ten lectures delivered by the Chichele professor of military history at Oxford university in the years 1909-1917. The lectures are not arranged in order of their first delivery but are so arranged as to encourage the development of certain conclusions in the mind of the reader.

The papers deal with the most fundamental ideas of political science. The author believes that "at its highest level the science of war is the science of government" and he proceeds to discuss the nature of the state, the nature of peace, of war, and of government, with the purpose of building conclusions regarding the proper conduct of war upon his earlier conclusions regarding the nature of the state and the nature of war.

Starting from the state, "the only known means of giving reality to the conception of right," since 1689 a national unit with political self-government, the argument proceeds to envisage the relations of the state with its neighbors. In view of the ever-present danger or opportunity for war in fulfillment of its own particular idea of a good life for its members, naturally the state "will find its mode of constituting itself as a fighting power." Inasmuch as war can never be eliminated as nature's method of testing the nations for survival, it behooves the state to adopt a form of organization calculated to the end in view.

In order to achieve effectiveness in the conduct of war the politicians, "in none of whom the author has any faith," should be put aside. A grand strategist, reminiscent of the Achæan *strategus,* should be put in charge of the state, with or without the formal displacement of the prime minister. The cabinet should be retained to keep the people content, by means of explanations, with their rulers. "The War should be conducted as a whole by a single minister." At the same time the civil services should be purged of the evil of party patronage and to the reformed civil services should be entrusted many business duties which now wastefully preoccupy the attention of the commander-in-chief.

On the whole, the results attained by these fervid efforts are not happy. A military man with a taste for politics, the author relies heavily upon the classic dogmas of the state. The state and the state alone succeeds in indentifying force with right, and "everyone is aware of this when he regards the state from within." A professor of military history, he is very enthusiastic regarding the benefits of war. "It is the possibility of war which constrains nations to make themselves efficient." In spite of certain suggestions of the necessity for an appeal to citizen soldiers in terms of a just cause, when their services are needed, in spite of a doubt that force can effect a change in ideas held by one's opponents, the general tenor of thought resembles that to be found in *Germany and the next war* too much to be well received in America or, it is hoped, in England. The somewhat uncandid criticism of Norman Angell in the lecture on peace is unpleasant, and the vicious and fatalistic stirring of the subject of German relations in 1912 will hardly seem believable today.

In few places does the writer make use of historical material to sub-

stantiate the argument. In most of the chapters some use is made of that highly generalized sort of history where troublesome detail is left out of account in the sweep of the author's vision of the "true" current of events. Only in the treatment of the Dardanelles episode does Mr. Wilkinson come to grips with the detailed facts and here there is all too plentiful a supply of material to support his plea for experts, and experts only, in the technical services.

Certain extraneous factors reënforce the general effect. The author is very personal and didactic, even for a lecturer. He is also very confident. "I have not had to change my mind during the war." He is grieved that his generation of admonitions to his fellow countrymen that their army, their navy, and their government were unfit have gone unheeded — grieved, but not surprised. The papers do not hang together well, and a great deal of repetition is noticeable. This is not a very stable foundation on which to build such radical conclusions as that the great aim of the state "may be said to be its own efficiency, and if, by the action of another state, that is threatened, the danger must be averted," or that "only the nation itself is to be the judge of what is vital to the nation."

PITMAN B. POTTER

War aims and peace ideals. Selections in prose and verse illustrating the aspirations of the modern world. Edited by Tucker Brooke, B.Litt. (Oxon), assistant professor of English, Yale college, and Henry Seidel Canby, Ph.D., assistant professor of English, Yale university. (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 264 p. $1.50)

The editors of this attractive little volume undertook a task of great magnitude, indicated not only by its title, but by its sub-title as well. They approach it rather from the standpoint of literature than from that of history, yet necessarily their choice falls upon certain speeches and state papers that must always be subject matter for the historian of the great war. In some cases they have gone far afield for their material, when, for instance, choosing Daudet's "Last class" of the Alsatian schoolmaster in 1871, the classic epics of Servia, the pacifist appeals of Tolstoy, and the Czecho-Slovak poems of the revolution of 1848. All these may be justified, however, as voicing the aspirations of these peoples that are only in the present times coming to realization. The editors by no means confine themselves to the masterpieces of literature evoked by the war. It is true they give as among the greatest Cardinal Mercier's "The uses of endurance"; Romain Rolland's "Civilization versus Kultur"; and Woodrow Wilson's "Program of the world's peace." Besides these, W. C. Abbott's "Cossack or republican"; William Allen White's "What the war did for Brewer" will have a limited

immortality. Among the poems the omissions are in evidence. One misses the familiar stanzas of Rupert Brooke and Alan Seegar, of Rudyard Kipling and John Masefield. Nothing is more invidious, however, than negative criticism in the case of such limited space as this small volume afforded. The inclusion therein of German, Russian, Serbian, and Czecho-Slovak voices differentiates it from other war anthologies, and gives it the cosmopolitan character that a full understanding of our own times demands. Indeed, it is offered "to the student of human nature and the philosophy of the war," that is, one presumes, among the English-speaking peoples. All that tends to broaden our vision, to make us understand how the "other half" thinks, feels, and expresses itself must be welcomed as a contribution to the public opinion that will make effective any league of nations, that must be created before we may have a federation of the world. To such an understanding this small volume contributes. The reviewer bespeaks on its behalf a wide distribution and reading.

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Reconstruction and national life. By Cecil Fairfield Lavell, Ph.D., associate professor of history, Grinnell college. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 193 p. $1.60)

An attempt is made in these two hundred pages to give a picture of the main factors, philosophical, literary, political, and social, in the national cultures of France, Germany, Russia, and England as these countries confront the problems of internal reorganization. Mr. Lavell preserves an instinctive generosity of tolerance throughout the study and merely attempts to picture things as they are, as a result of the growth of these great peoples since the French revolution.

On the whole, the result is not an unhappy one. The author certainly succeeds in bringing into attention most of the more general factors of the problem and in emphasizing the baffling complexity of the situation.

There are, however, serious deficiencies in the book which the author would, by his own intention in writing, desire to have called to the reader's attention. There is no treatment, or even notice, of the existence or operation of "high finance" in the European nations, nor are the economic facts of trade and industry canvassed. There is no attention to the problem of personal politics. The result is disastrous. Reconstruction in the European states is going to be determined, as to direction and scope, not without reference to the actual conjuncture of power of the bankers and the professional ministerial personages. Of two things one: either "reconstruction" will take place within a period of four or five years or the term is used to denote the future growth of the

nations in general. In the first alternative this treatment is too general; the additional time needed to read the three hundred and seventy pages of Hearnshaw's *Main currents of European history, 1815-1915* would be well repaid by the greater measure of detailed data given in that volume along with the interpretative work. In the latter case the field is unwieldly *in toto*. Such history as involves the statement: "The nineteenth century went on," is likely to lack the grit of reality. To deal with centuries in few pages in a very unsatisfactory proceeding.

Within the limits of these considerations, however, the author certainly achieves all that could reasonably be hoped for, and to the reader who knows the facts already the text is a delightful visit to old haunts.

P. B. P.

Social studies of the war. By Elmer T. Clark. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1919. 283 p. $1.50)

With unusual opportunities for close observation resulting from a long and intimate participation in many phases of war activities and among the civilian population in the leading cities of Europe, Mr. Clark makes some startling disclosures and gives the thinking world much cause for serious thought. He writes from the standpoint of the man in the street, yet his bias is that of a profound believer in the spiritual realities. His main thesis deals with the moral and religious status of Europe as a result of the war.

The author finds that the moral principles and conduct of the civilian population have been greatly lowered. There has been a letting down of barriers, due in some measure to the entrance of women into all kinds of war activities; while women have gained in economic freedom, they have lost immeasurably in the public estimation and in moral status. This sweeping statement is applied to all classes. The refugees, the wives and widows of the soldiers, left rudderless and open to all sorts of temptations, have especially suffered, and the home is in danger. The evil permeates the upper classes, and some of it, with considerable evidence, is attributed to German propaganda, particularly as it affected the efficient conduct of the war.

In this serious crisis, the author finds the church helpless in every way to cope with the problem. Its traditions and its working system are set in a groove which renders it useless as an organ of moral, social, or spiritual regeneration. In the war the established church was an obstructionist. It foolishly interfered with Sunday games among the soldiers and that, together with the exemption of the clergy from military service, has caused the church to lose prestige. The call is for disestablishment and reconstruction.

For this reconstruction the author sees little hope, since the great ideas

for which the war stands—democracy, human brotherhood, and social readjustment—are not acceptable to an autocratic church which distrusts the people. This is likewise true of the Roman Catholic church, which has lost caste by its apparent pro-German attitude and its participation in the Irish rebellion. In Italy, Belgium, and France the papacy is no longer respected.

In spite of his profanity and other weaknesses, the soldier, Mr. Clark finds, is essentially religious. The war has emphasized the God-idea, but the soldier's "natural religion" is unformulated and creedless. It needs a theology—a working principle—lest it drift into pure idealism, immorality, or be exploited by rationalism. There is a world-wide need, an immense opportunity, for the church if it can free itself from the dead weight of ecclesiasticism and become a spiritual church in reality.

Among the toilers and in the war-torn countries of Europe the author sees a new birth, but emphasizes the dangers from an untrained and ignorant democracy. He devotes some chapters to Ireland's problem, its historic background, and the possibility of adjustment. In one chapter he makes the "Heritage of hate" the most serious result of this world conflict. The alliance between Germany and Turkey, and finally the "City of horrible nights" in which he pictures with great vividness what Europe underwent in the air raids, form the subjects of the closing chapters of a book which, at least, gives us new light and a new demand for American participation in the world problem.

A new municipal program. By Clinton Rogers Woodruff. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1919. 392 p. $2.25)

The work of the National municipal league in the interest of better city government in the United States is or should be well known to all students of the social sciences. The present volume in the series published under the auspices of the league is perhaps the most noteworthy contribution made so far by the organization. Briefly, its purpose is the presentation of the model city charter which has been sponsored by the league and a discussion of the various features of the charter by the authorities who were originally responsible for its framing. The book follows in general principles the plan of its predecessor, *A municipal program* (Macmillan company, 1900), which first gave to the public the results of the league's six years of effort toward the formulation of "a working system consistent with American industrial and political conditions, and embodying the essential principles that must underlie successful municipal government in this country." *A new municipal program* is a presentation of the original thesis in the light of nineteen additional years of study and experiment.

The volume outlines clearly the general principles which the league

would urge for the development of better municipal government. A distinctive feature of the new program is its recommendation of constitutional provisions for a much larger measure of home rule for cities than was considered in the earlier program. Assuming wide freedom in self-government, the problem of individual cities becomes the problem of devising an effective vehicle for the expression of the popular will, the defining of a progressive municipal policy, and the securing of efficient men for the administrative offices.

Emphasis is placed upon the need of experts in city government, the subject of the chapter by A. Lawrence Lowell. Further chapters on civil service, constitutional municipal home rule, electoral provisions of the new program, the short ballot, administrative organization and related subjects, go far forward defining the various clauses of the model charter.

The final test of the value of such a work as this must be in the application of the principles espoused. On this score, of course, the book can not yet be judged; but in spite of the lack of experience which lies behind some of the provisions of the model charter, its presentation in this form, accompanied by the notes of the framers, makes it safe to predict that it will exert a strong influence in guiding municipal government along better lines "in harmony with the spirit of our institutions."

Evolution of the constitution of the United States of America and history of the Monroe doctrine. By John A. Kasson, LL.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1904. 273 p. $2.00)

This volume was originally written for the constitutional centennial commission, under whose auspices the centennial was celebrated at Philadelphia in 1887. It appeared as a part of the two memorial volumes then published. The present edition has been revised and contains some slight additions to the text. Its plan, as stated by the author, was to present "a clear but condensed recital of the conditions preliminary to the 'Confederacy'; a statement of the infirmities and ineffectiveness of the *Articles of Confederation*, upon which the founders sought in vain to build a practical government; its entire failure as a national bond, and the recognition of that failure by the patriots of the Revolution; the successive steps by which they sought the consent of the States to a general convention to provide a substitute government; and finally, the manner in which they accomplished the organization of a NATION. The leading contested clauses of the Constitution are considered separately, and the great points of the debate connected with each are given."

The author had in mind particularly the busy man of affairs, as well

as the student of public law, for whom he sought to present a brief but accurate account of the "great intellectual struggle which culminated in the adoption of the Constitution," in the hope that it would stimulate "popular devotion to its principles."

In this definite task he has achieved a distinct success. In less than 40,000 words he has given a story, reasonably accurate and very readable, of some of the main points of struggle and contention in the formation of our fundamental law. One who reads it will come away not only with a better understanding of the governmental theories embodied in our organic law but with a better understanding of the gigantic problems involved and of the marvelous judgment, courage, and common sense with which the fathers attempted their solution.

In the selection, arrangement, and presentation of material, the author has shown commendable judgment, fairness, and sense of proportion; although in devoting only four pages to the judiciary article, which is entirely inadequate, the author certainly lost his perspective. There are few principles of government more important, and upon which there exists greater confusion of ideas, than those involved in article III of the constitution, and yet they were practically ignored.

The last fifty pages of the book are devoted to the history of the Monroe doctrine, which is very well done. While it does not equal, in precision and discriminating scholarship, the short accounts of the doctrine that have been written by Moore and Root, it is vastly superior to most of the articles that have appeared.

The volume is written in a flowing, sometimes rhetorical style, which the general public will find very readable and which has not been achieved at an undue sacrifice of brevity.

ARNOLD BENNETT HALL

The old merchant marine. A chronicle of American ships and sailors. By Ralph D. Paine. [Chronicles of America series] (New Haven: Yale university press, 1919. 214 p. $3.50)

The reader who is seeking an entertaining and picturesque account of the marine achievements of certain of the great shipmasters of United States history will be well pleased with the present volume. Here he will find a well-told, spray-swept tale of shallop, schooner, packet, and clipper, of pirate, privateersman, and peace-time merchant, replete with incident and what the journalists call "human interest." Although a preface is lacking, it is perhaps correct to say that the purpose of the volume, and of the series as a whole, has been excellently carried out by the author.

For the reader of more specialized interest the volume is disappointing in several respects. The author has failed to make a balanced presenta-

tion of his subject and, by dwelling on the unique and spectacular, has frequently obscured fundamental matters of a general and routine character. This is most apparent in the colonial period where the extensive dealings of the "fair trader" receive inadequate attention and the important activities of the smugglers are not even hinted at. After all, it was in the venturesome voyages of a thousand nameless captains that the great development, as well as the real romance, of the merchant marine lay; and the monuments of their success were to be found in the countless well-defined trade routes which developed from their first daring exploits. This the author often fails to keep in mind.

The subject of the volume also demanded a less fragmentary treatment of the relation of governmental policy to the development of the merchant marine. The English navigation acts, though mentioned with adverse comment, are nowhere given credit for the great progress of colonial shipbuilding; nor is there any mention made subsequently of the importance of the American protective tariff policy in diverting capital from shipping into manufacturing. Finally, it is to be noted that the author perpetuates a famous textbook error concerning the war of 1812 in his statement that the prowess of the American sea fighters convinced Great Britain of the unwisdom of her policy of impressment.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER

The American Indian as participant in the civil war. By Annie Heloise Abel, Ph.D., professor of history, Smith college. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark company, 1919. 403 p. $5.00)

This is the second of a series of three volumes dealing with the slaveholding Indians of Indian Territory, as secessionists, participants in the civil war, and victims in the reconstruction period. From the battle of Pea Ridge, March 6-8, 1862, to the last of the raiding expeditions, in the spring of 1865, of Stand Watie, Cherokee and most capable and trustworthy of the Indian leaders, a detailed account of Indian activities for and against the union is presented. Because of the neglect and oversight of the federal government most of the tribes of Indian Territory affiliated with the confederacy in a diplomatic alliance, and had representatives at the seat of the confederate government. Nevertheless, they were of little use to the confederacy. Most of the tribes remained loyal to the end, but few could be depended upon at critical times. They refused to subject themselves to drill and discipline; they did not hesitate to intrigue with the enemy; and they were constantly reverting to the most revolting practices of savage warfare. Hence little use was made of them except in the home guard and for raiding purposes.

Although the Indian was a poor soldier he was not wanting in patriotism. He never lost his love for home and country. This it was more

than anything else that attached him to the confederacy and caused him to waver with its rising and falling fortunes. Miss Abel makes it plain that he was, as always, conscious of the insatiable land hunger that was pressing down upon him in the form of politicians, speculators, and would-be captains of industry, often "rogues in the disguise of public benefactors." Thus at the very end of the conflict and when all seemed lost the Cherokee declined to give up a part of their country to the confederacy. When urged to do so as a means to their defense and self-preservation, they replied "To do this would be the end of our national existence and the ruin of our people. Two things above all others we hold most dear, our nationality and the welfare of our people. Had the war been our own, there would have been justice in the proposition, but it is that of another nation."

For both the confederacy and the union white officers were decided upon for all important places of responsibility in the Indian commands, but they were rarely such men as would inspire confidence and enthusiasm in their Indian allies. In fact this book is largely a narrative of jealousies and rivalries, interspersed with accounts of drunkenness and incompetency. Albert Pike and Douglas H. Cooper each understood the Indian, but like most of their associates they were unfitted by temperament, interests, and experience for all the requirements of commanders in a large frontier area. As a result, a large part of their time was consumed in making reports to Richmond and Washington and in watching each other. Removals and changes in policy were frequent and made for anything but a brilliant chapter in the military annals of the civil war.

Miss Abel has made a real contribution to the military history of the civil war. In fact, this is the only account there is of the activities in and about Indian Territory. A sketch map shows the main theater of warfare and the location of the tribes within the Indian country. A letter of fourteen pages from Albert Pike, "Citizen of Arkansas," to Major General Theophilus H. Holmes is given as an appendix. It portrays the rivalries and grievances of the frontier commanders, also the supremely selfish character of the Indian alliances on the part of those who coveted their lands and used the Indians incidentally to fight their battles.

The material for this book was drawn largely from documentary sources, among others the Leeper or Wichita agency papers, the Fort Smith papers, and official reports. The annotations are extensive and carefully prepared. The bibliography is exhaustive and the index is complete.

Charles H. Ambler

Fighting the spoilsmen. Reminiscences of the civil service reform movement. By William Dudley Foulke, LL.D. (New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1919. 348 p. $2.00 net)

Quite apart from its value as a repository of materials for use by future historians of American administrative practice, these reminiscences of one who participated actively in the campaigns of the civil service reform league in the years of its greatest labors provide splendid reading in themselves. There are woven together in this book the zeal of the reformer ("every other question has two sides"), a profound philosophy of democratic government, and the race and spice of actual politics, the whole blended by the hand of a very genial, very generous, yet very earnest student of public affairs and public men.

Beginning with some account of the origins of the reform movement, the author traces its uneven development during the next thirty-five years, pausing long enough on the salient episodes to furnish ample information on the individual phases of that development. In conclusion there is presented a brief summary of the results achieved since 1883; it is to be regretted that this summary is not more elaborate, for, although he has specifically confined his task to that of recording the data to be studied by other historians, surely Commissioner Foulke has a better vantage point from which to evaluate his own materials than a more unfamiliar student can ever have.

The speeches and papers reprinted in the appendix reveal the author in the light of a propagandist urging a certain policy, in contrast to that of a chronicler and commentator, and there is as much persuasion and cogent advocacy to be found therein as there is of light and sparkling interpretation in the narrative text.

Yet with it all, the volume deals — as Mr. Foulke confesses — with an era that is gone, the era of "mugwumps," of "reform" in American government, 1880 and the years following. The effort to hitch the subject fast to the war is not very effective; even a caution regarding the claims of preferment for office likely to be advanced by returned veterans somehow fails to awaken any real sense of danger. Perhaps that is because of the extent to which "the reform" has become a permanent part of our constitutional system; perhaps it is due merely to the fact that there was no "change of party" in 1917 and we should really find, in 1921, if there should be a change in that year, that all that has been achieved by executive order, and even by congressional statute, could be swept away by a party barred from the coveted offices. But also perhaps the effect — or lack of effect — is due to the fact that suddenly the older parties are being challenged so seriously as to their right to speak for American voters that the mechanical controls such as preference in appointments or even the placing of party workers in all the postoffices

are a little ineffectual in the premises. One does not make, guide, or suppress revolution by these devices.

The student of political science is certain to be interested in the author's belief that the object of the competitive system is not so much to provide an efficient civil service as to remove the temptation to use office for party power. One might well ask: is this a reform of our political parties or of our administrative system? The suggestion that it is the former accords with the analysis just made of the obsolescence of the problem itself. The older parties may be cured of their bad practices by other means than the "merit system."

It cannot be too clearly repeated that this is a volume in a thousand for students of American historical politics.

P. B. P.

Life of John Marshall. By Albert J. Beveridge. In four volumes. Volume III, *Conflict and construction, 1800-1815*; volume IV, *The build- of the nation, 1815-1835.* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1919. 644; 668 pp. $10.00 net)

With these volumes Mr. Beveridge brings to completion his monumental biography of Chief Justice Marshall, thus securely linking his name with one of the great republicans of the history of the republic. The excellencies of the previous volumes are again in evidence here — thoroughness of research, skill in summarizing and arranging a vast accumulation of material, dramatic narrative. Moreover, the principal fault of those volumes almost disappears in these: Marshall is now a great enough figure in his own right to dominate the elaborate background provided for his activities.

Volume III opens with the beginning of Marshall's judicial career. The federal judiciary is under fire from the triumphant republicans; that it emerged from the ensuing contest, not unscathed, but body-whole, was due in great part to Marshall's political skill. The writer of this review pointed out some years ago that the case Marbury *v.* Madison bore all the earmarks of "a political coup." Mr. Beveridge accepts this analysis, and is able, moreover, to confirm it by a striking discovery of his own — a letter from Marshall to Justice Samuel Chase bearing the date, in the original, of January 23, 1804 (3:176-177). Unquestionably, however, the 1804 is old-style for 1805, for the document was clearly penned while Chase's trial from impeachment was just getting under way. If this impeachment succeeded, Marshall saw himself and the entire existing bench swept from office, and their places taken by republican sympathizers with the doctrines of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. How was the danger to be averted? Why, congress was to give up the right of impeachment and to receive instead the right to review the decisions

of the supreme court! For the threatened recall of judges was to be substituted the recall of their decisions.

The second half of volume III is given over, for the most part, to a detailed account of the Burr conspiracy and Burr's subsequent trial for treason. This is the vulnerable part of Mr. Beveridge's work. In his effort to defend Marshall's handling of the law case, he has felt it necessary to make himself also the champion of Burr, and so has fallen easy victim to Mr. McCaleb's brilliant special pleading. The whole question is, of course, far too involved to warrant an attempt at fresh discussion of it within the limits of a review. On the crucial question of whether an "overt act" has been shown against Burr, I venture to refer the reader to relevant pages of my *John Marshall and the constitution.* Mr. Beveridge's treatment of this matter clearly does not meet the contentions which I there advance. Nor does he give adequate heed to the fact that the extraordinary line of reasoning developed by the chief justice in his famous opinion received no support from the arguments of any one of the seven or eight excellent lawyers on either side of the case.

It is Mr. Beveridge's task in his final volume to provide Marshall's great constitutional decisions with their historical setting. The task is achieved with enviable success. Chapter I of the volume contains another noteworthy find, a letter from Marshall to Robert Smith of Baltimore, dated July 27, 1812. The writer is obviously posturing, awaiting the descent of the presidential thunderbolt. Fortunately it did not descend; and from this time on Marshall drops all his political nonsense.

Noteworthy, too, is the fresh account given in chapter III of the Fairfax litigation, a fearfully complex topic which is handled with great skill and clarity and upon which the analogous Granville case is made to throw an interesting sidelight. Chapter IV on "Financial and moral chaos" is so excellent and so much of a contribution that one is tempted to urge that it be published as a separate brochure. Incidentally, it brackets "the bank case" (McCulloch *v.* Maryland) with the Dartmouth college case in an instructive way. The handling of the Dartmouth college case itself, however, is not so entirely unexceptionable. Mr. Beveridge's strictures on Shirley's invaluable volume (4: 258-259 footnote) seem a bit severe, though he is probably right in challenging the assertion (Shirley, p. 237) on which Mr. Lodge bases his cock-and-bull story of Webster's argument before the court. Elsewhere (footnote, p. 233) Mr. Beveridge challenges Harvey's anecdote to the effect that, since the college was founded for the education of Indians and none had attended for some time, Webster advised President Brown to send for some, which was done, albeit the aborigines escaped before any use could be made of their presence. "There is not the slightest evidence to support this absurd

tale,'' says Mr. Beveridge. Nevertheless, it is a fact that one of the charges levelled against the trustees of the college by the legislative committee whose report led to the invasion of the charter, was ''refusing to apply any of the funds of which they have control, to the instruction of Indians'' (Lord, p. 71), and it is to be supposed that some effort was made to invalidate this criticism. On the other hand, Mr. Beveridge is unduly tender of old Professor Goodrich's famous account of Webster's peroration. This account, which first appeared in print in 1853, attributes to Webster, in closing, the following words: ''I would not, for this right hand, have her [the college] turn to me and say, *Et tu quoque, mi fili!*'' But we have it from an absolutely contemporary source that William Wirt closed his oration against the college with the words ''*Et tu, Brute,*'' which, however, were assigned by him to the ghost of Wheelock addressing Webster (Lord, p. 150). The parable is deadly. Fortunately, Mr. Beveridge's critical faculty is usually quite alert, and in his excellent account of Gibbons *v.* Ogden he punctures very neatly the old story that Webster prepared his famous argument in that case over night (p. 424-425, footnote).

One considerable disappointment with these admirable volumes I must own, for I had expected to find a final chapter devoted exclusively to an effort to assess the personality and achievement of the great chief justice. This task, however, Mr. Beveridge has chosen to leave for each reader to perform for himself, a concession for which discerning readers will not be altogether grateful. In his chapter entitled ''The supreme conservative'' Mr. Beveridge does indeed furnish a valuable clue, but it is rather by the way. Moreover, the designation, ''supreme conservative,'' though in fact used with the utmost precision, will be apt to mislead many whose usage is less precise. Marshall was a *conservative*, but the two great principles he was conservative of, nationalism and individualism, were the very platform of the European liberal movement throughout the nineteenth century. Today many reckon these principles reactionary, but that is because the pursuit of happiness is no longer the purely individual enterprise it formerly was but is more of a collective enterprise — a transformation which has affected Jefferson's standing as a liberal fully as seriously as it has Marshall's.

Mr. Beveridge has done a fine, serious piece of work, a work whose value will endure as long as interest in the most distinctive of American institutions shall endure. More than that, it is a unique piece of work. For what other American public man of Mr. Beveridge's eminence has ever turned historian and man of letters with a result at all equivalent? One thinks of Mr. Roosevelt's *Winning of the west* as the most nearly comparable achievement — but then, Mr. Roosevelt was not yet a public

man when he wrote those entrancing volumes. Perhaps the hope may be voiced that Mr. Beveridge has not yet exhausted his evident versatility.

EDWARD S. CORWIN

Lemuel Shaw. Chief justice of the supreme judicial court of Massachusetts, 1830-1860. By Frederic Hathaway Chase. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1918. 330 p. $2.00 net)

It was, of course, inevitable that Mr. Chase should begin his excellent biography of Chief Justice Shaw with some such words as the following: "It is doubtful if the country has ever seen a more brilliant group of lawyers than was found in Boston during the first half of the last century." The statement is quite true, and none the less so because it could have been made with equal propriety of a half dozen other cities of the period. The fifty years from 1800 to 1850 was the golden age of the American bar.

Mr. Chase's volume lacks brilliancy but more than compensates for this deficiency with its qualities of directness, concreteness, and solidity — qualities admirably adapted to its theme. Shaw is presented in all the relations of life, as the dutiful son, the diligent student, the hard-working, conscientious attorney, the learned judge, dominating his bench without domineering over it, the devoted husband, the considerate father, never losing touch with or interest in the concerns of his children. The picture is a gracious one, and Mr. Chase leaves us no doubt that it is a good likeness.

Mr. Chase's assessment of Shaw's actual contribution to the law is unfortunately less successful. Chapter VIII, entitled "Shaw's part in the development of the law," is good so far as it goes, but it is altogether inadequate, particularly in the matter of background and comparison; and chapter VI dealing with "Constitutional law" is at points misleading. As a loyal son of Harvard it behooved Mr. Chase not to extend his reading on the subject of judicial review beyond the writings of J. B. Thayer, and the effect of his self-denial is evident in his treatment of this important subject (p. 147 ff.). His later dictum (p. 159) that Shaw's "influence on the development of constitutional law, it is safe to say, has been second only to Marshall's" is of a like parochial provenance. Shaw's influence on the origins of our constitutional law was not negligible, but it was vastly less important than Kent's, for instance, and his contribution to the *present content* of this body of jurisprudence is comparatively slight.

It is interesting to compare Marshall and Shaw as judicial stylists. Both insisted on stripping questions of their complexities and reducing them to basic principles; both had a scorn of precedents; the opinions of both were discursive, though Shaw's were the more so. Marshall's

superiority lay in the orderly development of his argument and the aphoristic crispness of his phrasing; Shaw's lay in the wider range of his illustrative matter.

As has been stated, Shaw dominated his bench, wherein he again resembled Marshall; and what is more, the leadership of both judges rested to no small extent on the affectionate regard which they stirred in their associates. Indeed the worshipful attitude of all and sundry toward Shaw in his later years was not without its humorous aspects at times. "One winter," Mr. Chase relates (p. 290), "when the court was sitting at Barnstable Judge Merrick, one of his colleagues, slipped on the icy steps and fell, breaking three ribs. The old janitor ministered to the injured judge as he lay waiting the coming of the doctor, groaning in severe pain. Searching for the bright lining to what seemed to be a pretty dark cloud, the janitor remarked soothingly, 'Well, Judge Merrick, how thankful you must be it wasn't the Chief Justice.' "

It seems to be implied on page 21 that the Phi Beta Kappa society originated at Harvard. This, of course, is not so.

E. S. C.

Letters of Susan Hale. By Caroline P. Atkinson. Introduction by Edward E. Hale. (Boston: Marshall Jones company, 1918. 483 p. $3.50)

The hurly-burly of modern life is not conducive to the perusal of formal essays or collections of letters, the reading of which should not be hurried but thought over, talked about, and enjoyed with one's friends. But when a collection of letters, so full of life and wit and humor, so sparkling and clever as the *Letters of Susan Hale* is presented to the public, it should meet with approval, for few bits of fiction could be more fascinating and few histories could give a better account of social life during the nineteenth century.

Susan Hale had a brilliant personality. As a daughter of Nathan Hale and Sarah Preston Everett, and as a sister of Edward Everett Hale and Charles Hale, consul-general in Egypt, she came in intimate contact with such people as Emerson, Lowell, and others prominent in the social and literary circles of Boston, Newport, Paris, and other cities. Her broad education and her rich experiences and associations give high historical value to the collection of letters, while the funny little illustrations and the charm of the writer's style, make of the book a delightful human document.

Edward E. Hale has written a sympathetic introduction, giving an appropriate setting for the collection that follows. The book is excellently bound, contains a useful index, and shows withal an excellent choice and arrangement of material.

Esther M. Dole

Abraham Lincoln as a man of letters. By Luther Emerson Robinson, A.M., professor of English, Monmouth college. (Chicago: Reilly and Britton company, 1918. 342 p. $1.50 net)

Mr. Robinson's book consists of two parts, a study of the development of Lincoln's character, intellect, and style, following the writings in chronological order; and an anthology, each selection from the speeches being preceded by a paragraph of explanation and criticism. With the exception of the communication of 1832, the speeches are from 1854 and later. As illustrations of the preceding study it would seem desirable to give some brief specimens from the intermediate period, which is in such marked contrast to the final product. The earlier period is rather fully represented in the selections from the letters, though these might well have been supplemented by some of the more striking telegrams to generals in the field, especially the two dispatches to General Hooker. The fact that this class of writings is wholly confined to the civil war period adds to their interest. The selections close with the poems and two fragments on the study of law. A bibliographical note and an excellent index close the volume.

In his estimates of the separate writings and in his general conclusions, the author shows saneness and good judgment. While not attempting an original contribution, he has made discriminating use of the available material and very few errors have been noted. The statement about the source of the passage "You can fool all the people" is perhaps too decided and on page 172 occurs the apocryphal story of Everett's congratulating Lincoln after the Gettysburg address, undoubtedly suggested by Everett's note to Lincoln.

The most valuable single feature of the book is the attempt to connect Lincoln with the onward march of democracy, as shown in the following extract from the conclusion: "The world is discovering this as the genuine *American spirit*, made secure and prophetic by the remarkable personality and insight of Lincoln. This, chiefly, let us say, gives soul and permanence to the literature he has left us."

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE

Educational legislation and administration in the state of New York from 1777 to 1850. By Elsie Garland Hobson, head mistress of the Phebe Anna Thorne model school of Bryn Mawr college. (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1918. 268 p. $1.60)

One can not commend too highly the type of work in the history of education undertaken by the University of Chicago and represented in Miss Hobson's monograph. This is the first of a series of monographs the purpose of which, Mr. Jernegan points out, is to "supply, in part, the gap in our knowledge of educational legislation in different states"

by giving the text of the most important laws; to record every act or portion of an act bearing on education and to provide the information necessary for finding the text of the act; to analyze and make intelligible this legislation; and to present special types of legislation for the different states.

In the treatment of educational legislation in New York Miss Hobson makes a brief survey of "formative influences" and traces the development of the dual system of control to 1820. The subject then naturally differentiates into a consideration of secondary and higher education and of the common school system. There are chapters on special legislation for cities, school support, and education for special classes. Four valuable appendixes include a chronological list of academies, a list of acts granting support to academies, a list of educational societies, and a list of titles and dates of acts relative to education.

The author says that her work is "little more than a chronicle of legislation and an exposition of results." The limitations due to the character and scope of the work are obvious. It is manifestly impracticable to print any considerable number of the nine hundred and seventy-five laws listed; it is, however, greatly to be regretted that the most significant of these laws are not given in their actual and complete form. The extensive quotations and accurate summaries do not supply the need of the scholar for the complete document, especially where the different provisions of the act are taken up under the various topics to which they relate. The use of different type for quotations from laws and reports is a desideratum. The monograph, however, undoubtedly adds very largely to the knowledge of educational legislation, constitutes in its particular field a valuable history of education in New York, and is an important contribution to early American educational history.

Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1918. Edited by Christopher Wren. (Wilkes-Barré, Pa.: Printed for the society, 1919. 335 p. $4.00)

This is a volume for the antiquarian rather than for the historian. The pioneers of the Wyoming valley may find it pleasant reading and he who uses a sprinkling pot to irrigate genealogical trees may be rewarded with a few new shoots which otherwise would never have seen the light, but the historian will find little in it to pay him for the hours spent in perusal of the volume.

Only two portions of the book have distinct historical value. In the section entitled "Some early recollections," Mr. George R. Bedford has allowed himself to be reminiscent regarding his legal colleagues and conditions in the Wyoming valley before and during the civil war. Mr. Bedford's retentive memory has brought back vividly the manners and

customs of a bygone generation and well does he remember the early town of Wilkes-Barré. It is interesting to know that men used to wear shawls instead of overcoats and that women wore woolen socks instead of rubbers. It is pleasant to welcome the soldiers returning from the Mexican war and to watch the circus parade, even though the elders would not let the boy get inside the tent. It is not so pleasant to climb on a roof to get a good look at a hanging in the jail yard and it makes one a bit melancholy to visit the village graveyard in which the "shining white marble and polished granite shafts were absent." But we soon regain our spirits by attending dances and picnics, even though there was a prejudice against "round dancing." The sleigh ride and the bottle of champagne which he found "then and since agreeable to the taste" enable us to lay aside the "Recollections" with a feeling of amiability.

Mr. Lyman Belding, a California ornithologist who died in 1917, left an autobiography. Mr. Belding spent a few years of his boyhood in the Wyoming valley, hence the appearance of the autobiography in the *Proceedings* of the society. A healthy spirit of outdoor life runs through the sketch which would make it fairly good material, if properly revised, for some nature study magazine. But only one part of it is of interest to the historian. In 1851, Mr. Belding shipped on a whaler. Those were the days "when the American clipper ship was in its glory." From New Bedford to the Azores and down the African coast sailed the good ship *Uncas*, then around the Cape of Good Hope and over to New Zealand. Guam, the sea of Japan, Behring sea, Petropavlovski and Honolulu were visited and at the last named place the sailor deserted. On the *Julian* he coasted Mexico and South America and returned to Honolulu, where he shipped on the *Philomela*, which brought him to New York by way of the Horn in 1854. The story is well told and gives a vivid picture of the whalers of the fifties.

Under the title "Royalty in Wyoming valley nearly a century and a quarter ago," Oscar J. Harvey has written a superficial sketch of Louis Philippe and his family. The fact that the prince spent three or four days in the valley and that when he was king of France he patronized George Catlin and a band of Iowa Indians appear to be the excuses for the paper. The extracts from the diary of Elder David Dimock and the biographical sketches of the deceased members of the society are of interest only to the genealogist and to the local historian.

T. M. Marshall

Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688. By Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Ph.D. (Princeton: Princeton university press, 1914. 271 p. $1.50)

This book fills a long-felt need in a generally satisfactory way. The mass of source material on colonial Virginia published in recent years, together with the constructive work of Bruce and Alexander Brown, have at length made possible the writing of something like an authoritative history of the early period of the "Old Dominion." Mr. Wertenbaker has taken advantage of this admirable opportunity.

In dealing with the foundation of the colony, the author has used Brown's *Genesis* and *First republic* freely, but with discrimination. The result is a well-balanced account of origins that will meet with the approval of most scholars. A chapter on "The establishment of representative government" treats the all-important subject of the beginning of legislative government in America. Berkeley's administration and Bacon's rebellion are given full treatment, and the conclusions reached seem warranted by the evidence. A chapter on "The period of confusion" deals with the difficult time following Berkeley's retirement; "The critical period" completes the volume.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Wertenbaker finds the critical period of Virginia colonial history to be the last years of the Stuart régime. "The Glorious Revolution [1688] was a victory for liberty even more important to Virginia than to England. It brought to an end those attacks of the English government upon the representative institutions of the colony that had marked the last ten years." As this period of Virginia history has been insufficiently emphasized, Mr. Wertenbaker is wise in laying stress on it. At the same time, it may be said that the whole colonial history of Virginia was, in a sense, critical because during the entire period American institutions were in the making and any check given the development of the house of burgesses would have been a blow to American civilization. It was not until 1765 and the days of Patrick Henry that the final crisis was passed.

Students may take exception to the frank approval of Dale's administration and to the slight treatment of the Cromwellian age in Virginia history, although the materials are scanty for 1650-1660. Mr. Wertenbaker has not attempted to write an economic or institutional history. Within its limits his work is not likely to be superseded.

H. J. Eckenrode

The iron hunter. By Chas. S. Osborn. (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 316 p. $2.00)

The most interesting thing about *The iron hunter* is the hunter. This volume is the autobiography of a "hyperkinetic." It carries the reader along through its pages as on the current of a mountain stream leaping

and tumbling forward in sheer joy of tumultuous action. "I always went with all my might at whatever my hands found to do," says the author; and the reader has no doubt about it as he lays down the book. This volume of over three hundred pages can be read almost at a sitting, so intensely fascinating and rapid is the action; it carries to the reader the conviction that he has lived and moved for the time with a great man. Not only the author but the story is typically American in the best sense.

Chase Salmon Osborn was born in 1860 in Indiana, where he spent a boyhood of hardships in the rural surroundings of a western pioneer community. His parents, both physicians, of British and colonial ancestry, were early in his life reduced from comparative affluence to poverty. They were idealists of the hardy type produced on the frontier. Like his father, Osborn was in his boyhood, as ever in his career, a fighter for righteousness, and especially for what he considered his own rights. At eight he thrashed a boy for deriding his horse. At eleven, as a newsboy, he volunteered to carry papers "in a part of the town where the carrier was always being licked and his papers destroyed"; he used a revolver to good effect, though without hitting anyone, and carried his papers in that quarter thereafter unmolested. At twenty-three he was in Florence, a frontier iron mining town in Wisconsin, where he bought and published the *Mining News* and carried on a successful campaign to clean out organized prostitution, enjoying numerous escapades with "Old Man Mudge" and his outlaws, than whom "no sea pirate was ever more bloodthirsty or vengeful." At twenty-seven he had located at Sault Ste. Marie as a newspaperman and owner of the *News*, where many were his fights with opposition sheets and numerous the libel suits brought by him against political opponents.

Coupled with his fighting qualities was his *Wanderlust* and love of adventure. At ten years of age, filled with stories of Daniel Boone and other Indian fighters and armed with an old bored-out army musket and a savage-looking bowie knife made from a corn cutter blade, he and another boy ran away from home and got fifty miles away before caught. From then on he ran away annually, on one occasion walking some two hundred miles into the wilds of the Michigan lumber woods in Newaygo county, where he spent a winter in the camps as a chore boy, incidentally suffering a terrible thrashing at the hands of the camp bully. At eighteen he left home permanently, walking much of the way to Chicago, where he arrived with fifteen cents in his pocket — "every cent I had in the world" — and the barber took that. Later he made up his mind to go to Milwaukee, walking most of the eighty-five miles, learning the ways of the professional hobo, but always keeping his self-respect. At Milwaukee he drove a coal wagon and did newspaper work, then went farther north to Florence. It was his exploring trips into Canada that later

led him to the "Soo." The great wild north drew him with irresistible power, "like a loadstone." "If I had not gone," he says, "something in me would have busted; now I don't mean burst — something ruder than that." From the "Soo," which Mr. Osborn has ever since made his home, he later went to Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and to the farthest islands of the seas, much of the time prospecting for iron. On the island of Madagascar he discovered an extensive range of iron ore, having previously, in 1889, discovered the Moose mountain iron range in Canada which brought him wealth.

Osborn's early education is interesting. "My parents," he says, "would teach us American history traditionally, and they were both well informed. As my father loved or hated so did I come to do." At thirteen Osborn was in the Lafayette high school and at fourteen he entered Purdue university, where he spent three years "of mingled happiness and bitterness," getting on with his work satisfactorily but so poorly dressed as to be subject to the derision of richer boys, one of whom, he says, "would call attention in a loud voice to the fact that I wore no undergarments and often no socks, and that my shoes were cowhide." Of this fellow, whose name was Jim Reidy, Osborn writes, "He was a handsome young animal, and I couldn't like him as I found out. Secretly I half admired him, altogether envied him and often came near to a determination to murder him. Reidy married a charming co-ed and became a partner in his father's banking business. They expanded into a string of banks. A panic struck them; there were irregularities and Jim was sent to the penitentiary. I did not learn of this for a long time. I was governor of Michigan when I did find it out and I was not only sorry for Reidy but at once endeavored to do what I could for him." The end of his stay at Purdue he describes thus: "One night at the end of my third year, I attended a commencement reception at President White's house. Several of the young men wore evening dress suits. I had never seen one before and the mental effect they had on me was as strange as it was ludicrous. All along I had been struggling to get far enough into style to wear an undershirt, and here were these claw hammer coats. The case was hopeless; the odds were too terrible to struggle against. Then and there I vowed to leave school for good, and I did. I was seventeen."

Newsboy, student, day laborer, country editor, prospector, traveler, Osborn has hewed a straight upward course and the people of his adopted state have honored themselves by conferring upon him various offices of trust, among them that of regent of the University of Michigan (1908-1911) and governor of Michigan (1911-1912).

His career as depicted in this volume is worth study as a real romance of American life, full of good humor, rugged honesty, and fine idealism.

The style of the book reflects the author's journalistic work. Wit, homely philosophy, and good stories abound. A characteristic story is told of an interview when as governor of Michigan he had gone to Indiana as a guest of that state. A fine old gentleman named Kantz, of German extraction, remembered well Osborn's early escapades and particularly one in which he had thrashed another boy "right in church" for calling him a vile name, had tried to get a shotgun to kill him, was arrested, tried, and acquitted, but socially ostracized. On meeting the governor of Michigan the old man exclaimed: "Is dis der real Chase Osborn? Vat, ain't you hung yet?"

The volume contains many items of historical interest relating to the mining industries of the upper peninsula of Michigan and to political conditions in the state at the time Mr. Osborn was governor.

GEORGE N. FULLER

James Baird Weaver. By Fred Emory Haynes. [Iowa biographical series. Edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh] (Iowa City: State historical society of Iowa, 1919. 494 p. $2.00)

This book sketches with comparative rapidity the boyhood life of James B. Weaver on the Iowa farm, deals with his civil war experiences in greater detail, and then occupies itself with a lengthy account of his political career as republican, greenbacker, populist, and democrat. Weaver was "a skirmisher," a pioneer in the tangled wilderness of apathy and corruption which reigned in politics in the latter half of the past century. Before his death in 1912 he had seen enacted into law many, though not by any means all, of the reforms which he had advocated as leader of "a minor minority," and time had proved him a prophet of the new social order.

The paucity of significant material for the biographer's study made his task a difficult one; the scrapbook and the single letter file which constitute the bulk of the "Weaver papers" apparently contain little of indirect or unconscious revelation, of the sort of thing that Weaver might have said or written as a man, not as a public character. The other source material, such as speeches and newspaper reports, must of course have been prepared for public consumption. In using these sources, the writer makes little attempt at a critical evaluation. He says of certain newspaper accounts that they are "so plainly partisan and unfair to [Weaver] . . . that little dependence can be placed upon them"; but he quotes newspaper praise of Weaver without commenting on the bias of the source. He has consulted files of various Iowa newspapers and of the *Congressional record*, but has apparently paid scant attention to newspaper comment outside Iowa and the west, and has neglected what might be a fertile field of material — the greenback, populist, and

labor newspapers. He has made only slight use of two important manuscript collections, the Donnelly papers belonging to the Minnesota historical society and the Weller papers in the library of the Wisconsin historical society.

The sources which he did consult, however, rather obtrude themselves upon the reader in long and frequent quotation and in paraphrase so detailed that at times the trees obscure the woods. Considering the scanty amount of personal material consulted, the book is too long. It suffers from the inclusion of unimportant and sometimes irrelevant detail. One questions, for instance, whether it was essential to list the names of those of Weaver's children who were able to attend his golden wedding celebration; and one ponders in vain to find the historical significance of the fact that at his funeral services the Yeomen sat directly behind the ladies of the Women's Christian temperance union, and that it was Mr. F. V. Evans who sang *Does Jesus care?*

E. H. B.

From Vauquois hill to Exermont. A history of the Thirty-fifth division of the United States army. By Claire Kenamore. (St. Louis: Guard publishing company, 1919. 435 p. $2.00)

This book is evidently designed primarily for the veterans of the division. Thus the last 175 pages comprise an appendix containing complete rosters of the division personnel. The narrative text touches briefly on the organization of the division from Missouri and Kansas national guard units and its service in a quiet sector of the Vosges; it deals at great length with its service in the first five days of the Meuse-Argonne offensive. The book is illustrated with good photographs of battlefield scenes in France and has a good though small reproduction of the French general staff map for the division's scene of operations in the Argonne. There is no index.

As an account of the Thirty-fifth's operations in the Meuse-Argonne the book is of value from the historian's point of view. True, a large part of it is made up of narratives of individual heroism; but the account of the operations was apparently compiled in part at least from interviews taken immediately after the division was relieved. A fair number of messages and orders are introduced; but the author seems to regard them with a proper degree of critical caution. Further, he lets the division's shortcomings and failures be seen through the lines of his narrative.

The division probably did not have the success the character of its personnel deserved. On the first day it took Vauquois hill, one of the two commanding heights between Argonne and Meuse. Pressing on, the advance units finally reached Exermont; but they were too far weakened

by casualties and stragglers to hold what they had gained and had no support or reserve elements to relieve them. Finally it was necessary to draw the wrecks of the infantry units behind a line of resistance improvised from engineers, machine gun units, and slightly wounded. The whole division was then withdrawn for reorganization.

Judging by Mr. Kenamore's account, the weakness of the division lay in lack of training for open warfare and complete failure of liaison. Field officers failed to maintain axes of march and lost touch with adjoining and supporting units. Units and individual soldiers alike got out of hand or lost. Mechanical means of liaison broke down completely and liaison by runner failed because of the continual shifting of brigade and regimental headquarters. To judge by the narrative even brigade commanders did not grasp the possibility of differentiating between a message center and an advance P. C. On one occasion both commanding general and chief of staff were out of touch with division headquarters. The result of these defects was complete failure to control and direct the infantry attack or to coördinate it and support it with the artillery. The report of an army inspector, concluding that "after September 27th the Division was really one in name only, as maneuvering power with intact units except the engineers ceased to exist," laid the blame on faulty liaison, on poor discipline, and on the change of brigade and regimental commanders on the eve of combat.

These last are sore points with Mr. Kenamore. Volunteer and national guard troops, however excellent, can never be so by virtue of the discipline of the regular army; yet five days on the line should not cause a good guard outfit to become slack in saluting, as Mr. Kenamore admits the division did. As to changes in officers, the division evidently suffered by being from the first a field of jealousy between regular and guard officers. To this Mr. Kenamore impliedly lays a part of the removals from command on the eve of combat. In a sense he is justified by results in his criticism of these removals, as it is hard to see how the officers displaced could have failed more completely to keep their units in hand than did some of the men who replaced them.

Oregon. Her history. Her great men. Her literature. By John B. Horner, A.M., Litt.D., professor of history. (Corvallis, Oregon: Press of the Gazette-Times, 1919. 408 p. $2.00)

In his preface the author characterizes this work as the product of his personal intimacy of over half a century with the Oregon country. He acknowledges gratefully the assistance of a number of persons who like himself have been actively interested "in preserving and exalting the history of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. . . The reader will observe that the volume is offered essentially as a history of Oregon, with

only such reference to the story of the Pacific Northwest as may be indispensable in the introductory chapters." It is designed to give "such a condensed, authentic account of [approximately five hundred] events of importance to Oregon since she 'began to fly with her own wings' as will instruct the reader, create a love for Oregon, and arouse patriotic respect for her laws and institutions."

In the pursuit of this ideal the author divides his treatment into five epochs. The first epoch begins with the discoveries of Columbus on the mainland of the continent, and traces western discovery to the conclusion of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Epoch two begins with the independence of the American settlers in Oregon of the Hudson's Bay company in 1843, and continues until the establishment of the territorial government on March 3, 1849. Epoch four treats of the territorial period, 1849-1859, and epoch five extends from the latter date to the present. The announcement of these epochs is in lieu of a table of contents.

The work is evidently intended primarily for use by students of high and grammar schools, hence the array of historical information presented is marshalled in a way suited to make its strongest appeal to adolescent students who are not yet beyond exultant acquisition of minute and often dissociated pieces of information. The textbook arrangement of materials breaks the continuity of the narrative. The epochs are treated in strict annalistic order; events are thrown into juxtaposition which have no connection other than that of chronological sequence. Thus the reader will find it possible to fix in mind the period of an event, with some inevitable loss of its due perspective and meaning.

The author makes his most valuable contribution in drawing together so many events of interest belonging to the century or so since the American discovery of the Columbia river. He has avoided the controversial phases of northwestern history, stating his facts simply and in straightforward style. In so doing he has gathered a wealth of information which will foster strong local historical interest and pride. Conspicuous in this connection are the frequent references to "first" things: the first white women to ascend Mount Hood; the first ship on the Columbia; the first attempt to establish a trading post; the first school in the Pacific northwest; the first missionaries of the various denominations; the first celebration of the marriage ceremony; the first protestant church; and so on, throughout the volume, first happenings of what came later to be ordinary, repeated occurrences, will challenge the spirit of local pride in the young reader or awaken the pleasure of affectionate reminiscence in the older Oregonian.

Appeal to adolescent interest is made by the presentation of materials not always included in works of this kind. Some of these are a number of Indian creation myths, a description of early Indian fairs, a sample

of the Chinook jargon, mention of the Oregon caves, and accounts of stupendous forest fires of unknown origin. State pride is fostered by biographical notices of prominent people whose lives have touched Oregon in some special manner. Among these are Billy Sunday and Herbert Hoover. Californians endowed with as strong local pride as the author will note with interest the inclusion of Edwin Markham and Joaquin Miller among the Oregon literary celebrities.

The historical narrative of the fifth and final epoch, which treats events in the order of their occurrence under the successive governors of the state, comes to an anticlimax in a two-page list of Oregon congressmen and senators.

The utility of the text would be greatly increased by a rearrangement of the materials. The wealth of information concerning educational institutions might have been worked into a single chapter with better effect. The discussion of the Oregon Indian wars would have left a clearer impression had it been given similar continuous treatment. The narrative of political events could thus have received more comprehensive handling.

The index is not complete, many subjects and names mentioned in the text being entirely omitted from it. The printing and binding, done under war conditions, exhibit only excusable imperfections. The illustrations are copious and appropriate, and there is a useful map.

HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY

The Maseres letters, 1766-1768. Edited with an introduction, notes and appendices, by W. Stewart Wallace, M.A. (Oxon). [University of Toronto studies, history and economics series] (Toronto: Oxford university press, 1919. 135 p.)

To the modern historian accustomed to using archives the statement is trite that there is more illuminating material for the historian among the unprinted material than the printed. Yet the appearance of innumerable volumes of history based exclusively on the limited but well-known collections of sources and public documents proves that the lesson is still unlearned even in many of our colleges and universities. This publication has rescued the letters of Francis Maseres from the obscurity of the Hardwicke correspondence in the British museum, where are stored riches still almost untouched by historians of Great Britain and her colonies. The correspondence of the Hardwicke family, extending through the most important years of the eighteenth century, is particularly valuable to historians of America. Lord Hardwicke and his sons were conspicuous leaders of the "old whig" faction during its ascendancy and decline, and their own observations and those of their correspondents throw floods of light on colonial events so frequently ob-

scured in the documents emanating from administrative officers. In making public the letters of Francis-Maseres, one of the important officials of the *Vita Nuova* of British Canada, Mr. Wallace has performed a valuable service.

Maseres was attorney-general of the province of Quebec from 1766 to 1769 and "as such played no small part in the events and deliberations which culminated in the Quebec Act." His letters are addressed for the most part to "Fowler Walker, the London agent of the British merchants in Quebec. Though possibly not complete, for there seem to be gaps in the correspondence, they constitute a series of private letters almost unique, so far as the early days of British rule in Canada are concerned."

Maseres owed his appointment to the Rockingham ministry, which signalized an otherwise rather negative administration with the appointment of some carefully-selected men for the government of Canada. The attorney-general, capable and energetic, did not live up to expectations, however, since his Huguenot ancestry had implanted in him a prejudice against Catholics that he never overcame.

One of his duties was to assist in drawing up reports on conditions existing in the colonies. The mistakes of the proclamation of 1763 were to be corrected. Concerning these activities of Maseres there is considerable information of a rather intimate nature. The most important report with which he had to do was concerned with "the defects of the system of Judicature" that had been inaugurated. Maseres was requested by Governor Carleton to draw up a preliminary report which he completed in February, 1769. This was rejected. The letters here printed unfortunately throw little light on the obscure question of this rejection and the drafting of another report by the governor.

The letters contain interesting references to the authorship of the famous proclamation of 1763. In a letter of November 19, 1767, Maseres asserts that Governor Henry Ellis was its author (p. 62) and again on August 11, 1768, he writes: "Mr. William Grant of London . . . assures me that he saw the king's proclamation in Governor Ellises handwriting before it was published" (p. 99). The reviewer has somewhere run across a similar statement but has hitherto never been able to find corroborative testimony. Ellis was a great friend of Lord Halifax, and he may have influenced the final draft of the proclamation that was due to the latter.

Many other phases of the British administration in Canada during these early years are illuminated by the letters, and the editor is to be commended on making them available and for his careful editorial work.

C. W. Alvord

Our beginnings in Europe and America. How civilization grew in the old world and came to the new. By Smith Burnham, A.M. (Philadelphia and Chicago: John C. Winston company, 1918. 375 p. $.84)

This volume has been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the "committee of eight" of the American historical association. It covers two grades of elementary school work: the elements of ancient and modern history for the sixth grade and early American history for the seventh grade. The recommendations of the committee of eight are a complete vindication of the methods of the immortal Peter Parley — once so universally popular and then for a generation discredited — and the book under discussion is essentially Peter Parley up to date. It has the advantage of fifty years of scientific scholarship.

The work has been well done: the book furnishes an outline of world history in which matters of importance have been included and matters of less significance excluded with excellent historical judgment. Chapters on primeval man and early antiquity, the Greeks, the Romans, early Christianity, the beginning of the middle ages, early English history, life in the middle ages, and the growth of the English nation present in rapid survey the preliminary knowledge necessary for an understanding of American history.

In the latter half of the volume, chapters on "The Europe which found America," "The east and west," and "How Europe found America" treat with sufficient fullness pre-Columbian conditions and the story of the discovery. The Spanish empire and the first English attempts at settlement follow. A chapter is devoted to the settlement of Virginia and Maryland. The colonization of Virginia is given rather too briefly and without sufficient emphasis on its importance — a common fault in American school histories. New England and other colonies are treated satisfactorily, especially New England.

The book is written in an easy and interesting style and the successive contributions to American civilization are clearly pointed out. It is an excellent work for preliminary history teaching.

H. J. E.

New American history. By Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., professor of government, Harvard university. (New York: American book company, 1917. 650 p.)

This is a revision of the author's *Essentials in American history*, which was first published in 1905, and is intended to be used as a text in the high school. The high scholarship of the author is sufficient guarantee of the historical accuracy of the subject matter of the book. The illustrations are numerous and apt. The maps are excellent. On these points

all will probably agree. But there is room for a difference of opinion as to the author's method of presentation. On the whole, the book takes the form of a compendium dealing with a great many different topics; hence the treatment of these topics is usually very brief, and frequently statements are made which, while perfectly clear to the special student of history, are likely to be rather difficult of comprehension to the average high school student. The growth of our national history will require brevity and still more brevity in the future textbooks if they are to be compendiums and if they do not exceed the number of pages fixed by the publishers. The alternative method of presentation is by way of carefully formulating a few rather definite problems in American history and eliminating all matter that does not bear upon the solution of those problems. Such a method permits, as a rule, a fuller treatment of what is presented than the other method does. As yet no history textbook has been constructed along the line of the problem method, but such a book will have many things in its favor when it does appear. Mr. Hart's original *Essentials* was among the popular texts throughout the country and no doubt this recent revision will have a good following. It unquestionably compares favorably with the books that are current.

E. M. Violette

Story of agriculture in the United States. By Albert H. Sanford, professor of history, State normal school, Lacrosse, Wisconsin. (Chicago: D. C. Heath and company, 1916. 394 p. $1.00)

The author explains that this book "is intended primarily for boys and girls who live on farms"; though he expresses the hope "that it will be of interest to others, many of whom may have had experiences similar to those here recorded." He has therefore endeavored "merely to gather as far as they are now available, the more important facts of our agricultural history, and to enliven the account with interesting details and descriptions." Judged from this standpoint, it may be said that the work has been well done, for the story has been written in an interesting and instructive manner. As such it should be welcomed by teachers of American history in both rural and city schools, and it should make an appeal to general readers interested in our agricultural development.

The story begins with an interesting chapter on Indian agriculture in America, which is followed by five chapters descriptive of rural economy in the colonies and one chapter on conditions in the "back country" in the eighteenth century. The interest of leading statesmen in agriculture is emphasized; among these may be mentioned Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson. The westward movement of pioneer and planter into the Mississippi valley is treated in some half-dozen chapters which bring the narrative down to the civil war, the effect of which is then duly recorded.

The remaining chapters are devoted to the westward movement of the wheat-growing industry, hard times for farmers, the range and ranch cattle business, the revolution of agriculture by machinery, the new south, scientific agriculture, and irrigation and dry farming. The volume is completed by two chapters on rural life and rural problems.

Mr. Sanford's book is, in short, a popular history of the United States written from the agricultural point of view. As such it should serve to stimulate a more active interest in a most important, though hitherto neglected, phase of American history.

LOUIS BERNARD SCHMIDT

The dramatic story of Old Glory. By Samuel Abbott. Foreword by James M. Beck. (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919. 296 p. $1.60 net)

The dramatic story of Old Glory is a work well named and very readable. It will be especially enjoyed by the youths who love to hear of patriotism in action. The author's idea of associating the American flag with well-told incidents, as a means of carrying our youths through American history, is excellent as a basis for supplemental reading.

The author is to be congratulated upon his discernment in discarding embellished canvas and the beautiful Betsy Ross story as historical evidences, thus teaching the child that not all paintings and publications are necessarily gospel truths.

It is to be regretted that the author did not go more fully into the rest of that original correspondence between General Washington and the board of war (in the Library of congress) which shows that there was adopted in September, 1779, for the army, "as being variant from the Marine flag," a standard having a union and an emblem in the center with "the number of the Reg^{t} and the State to which it belongs inserted within the curve of the serpent," and that these were not made until the winter of 1782 and still undistributed on March 11, 1783. He has fallen into the common error of assuming that all mention of the "American flag" refers to the stars and stripes, whereas the army of the United States first began to carry the stars and stripes as national colors in 1841, as is brought out by Mr. Gherardi Davis in his very excellent books.

It is almost the only work on this subject, longer than a mere magazine article or short essay, that is especially attractive for our school children.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

The annual spring meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association will be held at Greencastle, Indiana, on April 29, 30, and May 1, DePauw and Purdue universities acting as hosts. The various sessions, as arranged by the program committee, will be devoted each to a special field: one will observe the tercentenary of the landing of the pilgrims, another will deal with the subject of river navigation, another with Lincoln; in addition there will be the customary teachers' session. Among the speakers are to be Messrs. M. M. Quaife, president of the association, D. L. McMurry of the University of Iowa, Jacob P. Dunn of Indianapolis, Howard C. Hill of the University of Chicago, Jesse W. Weik, and Major William C. Cochrane of Cincinnati. Informality is to be the keynote of all the addresses and of the open discussions afterward.

The social features of the meeting are to be given considerable emphasis: the visiting members will find their time outside the meetings filled with receptions, dinners, luncheons, and the like; while a feature will be an automobile trip to Lafayette and thence to the battle ground of Tippecanoe, arranged by Purdue university. The Greencastle golf club has generously offered free use of its course to visiting members who care to play, and automobiles will be provided to carry players to the links, "after the afternoon meetings," the chairman is careful to specify!

With such a list of attractions there should unquestionably be a large attendance and a correspondingly stimulated esprit de corps among Mississippi valley historians.

The Mississippi valley historical association was well represented at the meeting of the American historical association in Cleveland during the Christmas holidays, more than sixty-five members being in attendance. About twenty members of the executive and standing committees met at breakfast on December 29 for an informal discussion of business; later there followed the joint meeting with the American historical association, at which a number of papers were read. At the dinner held on December 30 for the Mississippi valley organization Mr. Albert J. Beveridge as speaker of the evening gave a delightful informal talk, telling how he came to write his biography of John Marshall.

The various states of the union are rapidly organizing the work of collecting their war records. A notable step forward was taken in Sep-

tember, when at a convention in Washington, D. C., a national association was formed to coördinate the work of the state agencies. This organization at once employed Mr. Newton D. Mereness (whose services were loaned for the purpose by the historical agencies of the six states of the Mississippi valley who have for some time past employed him to calendar material in the national archives) to prepare a survey of all the war history material in Washington. A further meeting of the association was held in Cleveland in December, and further plans were made for the future. So far the states most active in the work have been Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Robert M. McElroy of Princeton university is preparing an official biography of Grover Cleveland, and asks the readers of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review to coöperate with him in collecting the correspondence of the former president. As Mr. Cleveland wrote most of his letters in longhand and kept no copies, their collection is a difficult matter, and it seems certain there must be a large amount of material which has not yet been located. Mr. McElroy has already had turned over to him for his use all Mr. Cleveland's known papers, personal as well as public, including the collection from the Library of congress, the letters to Commodore Benedict, the collection of Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr. (formerly Mrs. Grover Cleveland), and a vast assortment of letters from personal friends and political associates. The biography when completed is to be published by Harper brothers.

Mr. William E. Dunn, associate professor of Hispanic American history in the University of Texas, resigned at the end of the fall term to accept the position of editor of the Latin-American section of the *New York Sun*. During the week of January 11-17, he was in Washington acting as secretary for the delegation from Colombia in attendance at the Pan-American financial congress in session in that city.

Mr. Charles W. Hackett was made adjunct professor of Hispanic American history at the University of Texas following Mr. Dunn's resignation.

Mr. E. Merton Coulter, formerly professor of political science and economics at Marietta college, is now associate professor of history at the University of Georgia, Athens.

An elementary course in the study of society is offered by Henry Reed Burch and S. Howard Patterson in *American social problems* (New York: Macmillan company, 1919. 381 p. $1.20). The authors present

in a well-organized and readable manner an account of the outstanding features of American civilization and social problems. Each chapter is prefaced by a brief outline and followed by questions for discussion, topics for special reports, and references for collateral reading. The book should go far toward meeting the growing demand for material for the elementary study of American social phenomena.

In his volume, *Woodrow Wilson: an interpretation* (Boston: Little, Brown, and company, 1918. 291 p. $2.00), Mr. A. Maurice Low does not claim to have produced a biography of Mr. Wilson; rather he has made an attempt to give the American people an interpretation of the man as a leader. The book is well worth reading as a clear and forceful presentation of the character of the president and his motives in the war.

The *Indiana magazine of history* for December, 1919, contains an interesting memoir of Colonel Isaac White, an early pioneer of Illinois and Indiana. Typical of the many sidelights it gives on life in the territorial days is the mention made by Colonel White, in a letter to his wife, of several slaves which he owned and also of an indentured servant — this despite the famous antislavery article of the Ordinance of 1787.

A highly profitable program was presented at a meeting of the Indiana history conference held in Indianapolis December 10 and 11, 1919, under the auspices of the Society of Indiana pioneers.

The Minnesota historical society has organized sixty-eight committees in the various counties of the state to gather local material for its war history. An interesting account of all the plans under consideration, including the proposed publication of three volumes of documents, is given in the *Minnesota history bulletin* for August, 1919.

Two documents of more than usual interest are printed in the January issue of *Le bulletin des recherches historiques:* a *donation à cause de mort* made by the Baron Lahontan in Montreal in 1684, and a "Mémoire sur la partie occidentale du Canada, depuis Michillimakinac jusqu'au fleuve du Mississippi," a manuscript of unknown origin supposed to have been written about 1763 or a little later. It describes the route from Mackinac to the Mississippi via the Fox-Wisconsin route with considerable fullness; a description of the route by way of Chicago is then begun but unfortunately the editor has seen fit to divide the document, so that the remaining and most important part of this descripion is reserved for the next issue of the magazine. Other articles in the current number give biographical data concerning Jean-Baptiste Couilard de Lespinay, 1657-1735, and the family Gaultier de Varennes.